

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 5, 1956

(Legislative day of Friday, March 2, 1956)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Shepherd of our souls, who dost neither slumber nor sleep, we come yearning that Thy completeness may flow 'round our incompleteness, and around our restlessness Thy rest. Though our faces are shadowed by the tragedies that darken the earth, we lift them in faith to the light that no darkness can put out. As we spend our years like a tale that is told, may it be to the last page a record of service well done, of duty faced without flinching, of honor unsullied, and of far horizons of progress and achievement that ever beckon, as we fare forth toward journey's end; and then when comes the twilight and the evening star, and our working day is done, grant us a safe lodging and a holy rest, and peace at the last; through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., March 5, 1956.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, a Senator from the State of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WALTER F. GEORGE,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BARKLEY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ELLENDER, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 2, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had

passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 9428. An act to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9429. An act to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 9428. An act to provide for the procurement of medical and dental officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Public Health Service, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9429. An act to provide medical care for dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, with the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, reporting, pursuant to law, that during the 6-month period ended December 31, 1955, no contracts were negotiated by that Committee under the provisions of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Deputy Director, Mutual Defense Assistance Control, International Cooperation Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the sixth and seventh reports of that Administration, entitled "Soviet Bloc Economic Activities in the Free World," for the second half of 1954, and "Soviet Deterrents to Increased Foreign Trade," for the first half of 1955 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF REFUGEE RELIEF ACT

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Administrator of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

A letter from the Vice Chairman, the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission, New York, N. Y., reporting, pursuant to law, on the operations of that Commission, for the celebration in 1956 of the 100th anniversary of Theodore Roosevelt (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, De-

partment of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE FILED BY CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTRUCTION OF TERMINUS DAM, TULARE COUNTY, CALIF.

A letter from the Assistant Chief Engineers for Civil Works, Department of the Army, relating to construction of the Terminus Dam, Tulare County, Calif. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions adopted by the Young Republicans of California, at Palo Alto, Calif., relating to the administration's efforts to preserve peace, and so forth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the city and county of Honolulu, Hawaii, relating to the issuance of obligation bonds for the construction of certain public works; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by Olympia Council 394, Knights of Columbus, Flushing, N. Y., favoring the enactment of the so-called Bricker amendment, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SEGREGATION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF MISSISSIPPI LEGISLATURE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I hold here in my hand a copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 125, recently passed by the legislature of the State of Mississippi. The resolution deals with the recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States on the question of segregation in the public schools.

Mr. President, this resolution speaks for itself. It is a resolution of firm resolve. It is the resolve of a deeply hurt people who are hit harder than any other group of the Nation by the usurped power exercised by the Supreme Court in the school segregation cases.

This resolution represents the firm resolve of the group of people in Mississippi who now carry the main burden of public education for our white and colored people. The future of public education in Mississippi rests largely on this group and the people for whom they speak.

This is the firm resolve of the people of my State asking the Congress to submit a constitutional amendment in the

affirmative, clearly stating that the power over public education has never been surrendered by the States, and that the States still have their rights and powers to control their public schools and other State institutions of learning.

The resolution firmly declares the State will take all appropriate and constitutional measures to void the illegal encroachments on its powers, and calls on other States to join in reversing this trend of judicial legislation that usurps powers reserved to the States.

Mr. President, the people of Mississippi speak from their deep inner feelings and principles. They are not bluffing. They see a possible repetition of much that has happened there almost 90 years ago. But they are not afraid. They calmly face the days and the problems ahead.

The following words of Governor Coleman on his inauguration, January 17, 1956, addressed to those of the Nation outside Mississippi, represent the thinking of the citizens of our great State:

With the indulgence of those present, I should like now to address a word to the remainder of the Nation. I want to tell you that during the next 4 years the full weight of the government will unflinchingly be used to the end that Mississippi will be a State of law and not of violence. I want to remind you that for over 90 years the white and the Negro people of Mississippi have lived side by side in peace and harmony. I would like you, our friends outside Mississippi, to know that the great overwhelming majority of the white people of Mississippi are not now guilty and never intend to be guilty of any murder, violence, or any other wrongdoing toward anyone. History shows that the first white man ever to be legally hanged in Mississippi was executed for the murder of a Negro slave. I repeat that while we, the people of Mississippi, are unalterably determined as a matter of right and justice that the necessary rules of society shall be maintained, we do not any more approve of violence and lawlessness than you do.

We ask you to remember that by reason of the numbers involved, this problem is more acute here than in any other State in the Union. It is not something which can be viewed with complacency or ignored, and if you lived in Mississippi and knew the full situation, you would look upon it as we do.

Mr. President, I commend the Mississippi Legislature for its timely efforts to protect and preserve the powers and rights of the State against usurpation by the Federal Judiciary, and for its sane and sensible appeal to other States for like action. I support them in their move.

I urge that the Congress heed the appeal of the State of Mississippi and other States to stop the encroachments of the Federal Judiciary upon the powers of the States, including the proposal of submitting an amendment to the States for ratification.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be included in the body of the Record at the end of my remarks, and that the resolution itself be appropriately referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 125

Concurrent resolution condemning and protesting the usurpation and encroachment on the reserved powers of the States by the Supreme Court of the United States and declaring that its decisions of May 17, 1954, and May 31, 1955, and all similar decisions are in violation of the Constitutions of the United States and the State of Mississippi, and are therefore unconstitutional and of no lawful effect within the territorial limits of the State of Mississippi; declaring that a contest of powers has arisen between the State of Mississippi and said Supreme Court and invoking the historic doctrine of interposition to protect the sovereignty of this and the other States of the Union; and calling on our sister States and the Congress for redress of grievances as provided by law; and for other purposes

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of Mississippi (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Legislature of Mississippi unequivocally expresses a firm determination to maintain and defend the Constitution of the United States, and the constitution of this State, against every attempt, whether foreign or domestic, to undermine and destroy the fundamental principles, embodied in our basic law by which this Government was established, and by which the liberty of the people and the sovereignty of the States, in their proper spheres, have been long protected and guaranteed;

That the Legislature of Mississippi explicitly and peremptorily declares and maintains that the powers of the Federal Government emanate solely from the compact, to which the States are principals, as limited by the plain sense and long recognized intention of the instrument creating that compact;

That the Legislature of Mississippi firmly asserts that the powers of the Federal Government are limited, and valid only to the extent that these powers have been conferred as enumerated in the compact to which the various States assented originally and to which the States have consented in subsequent amendments validly ratified;

That the inherent nature of this basic compact, apparent upon its face, is that the ratifying States, parties thereto, have agreed voluntarily to confer certain of their sovereign rights, but only specific sovereign rights, to a Federal Government thus constituted; and that all powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, have been reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

That the State of Mississippi has at no time, through the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, or in any manner whatsoever delegated to the Federal Government its right to educate and nurture its youth and its power and right of control over its schools, colleges, educational and other public institutions and facilities, and to prescribe the rules, regulations and conditions under which they shall be conducted;

That the aggrandizement of powers by the Federal Government has grown far beyond that ever conceived by the authors of our Constitution, that the seizure and concentration therein of powers not granted by the compact under which the several States entered this Union, and particularly that by which Mississippi entered the Union on December 10, 1817, threaten to reduce these sovereign States to mere satellites, and to subject us to the tyranny of centralized government, so rightfully abhorred by the founders, and for the prevention of which they exercised their finest genius;

That in late years the encroachment upon the reserved rights of the States and of the people has grown apace, and the proponents of the acts of encroachment have grown so emboldened that not one of the sister States and its people have escaped the oppressive hand thereof: In the destruction of their vested property rights; abridgments of their liberties; control of their institutions, habits, manners, and morals by centralized bureaucratic instrumentalities; and in fact by various wrongful and obtrusive acts, too numerous to be here documented, but so consistently characterized by an oppressive course of action so as to seriously threaten to completely destroy our constitutional processes and substitute in lieu thereof ideologies foreign to the soil of our beloved land;

That one of the noblest characteristics of our people is the reverent respect for and obedience to the courts of law and justice, and that which more than any other has ennobled our institutions of government, and ought to be challenged only with the most dreadful reluctance, still it should be solemnly and firmly declared that the hand of tyranny ought to be stayed from whatsoever source it might strike;

That we profess an undying attachment to and a warm regard and respect for the sister States, and for this Union, which, through unwarranted and unconstitutional action of the Supreme Court, is fastly being dissolved by usurpation of powers reserved to the States and transferring them to an all-powerful centralized Government which, unless halted, will reduce the States to impotent vassals, sheared of all rights and powers except those received at the sufferance of the Federal Government;

That a question of contested power has arisen; the Supreme Court of the United States asserts, for its part, that the States did in fact prohibit unto themselves the power to maintain racially separate public institutions, and the State of Mississippi for its part asserts that it and its sister States have never delegated such rights;

That the flagrant assertion upon the part of the Supreme Court of the United States, accompanied by threats of coercion and compulsion against the sovereign States of this Union, constitutes a deliberate, palpable, and dangerous attempt by the Court to usurp the exercise of powers not granted to it;

That the Legislature of Mississippi asserts that whenever the Federal Government attempts to engage in the deliberate, palpable, and dangerous exercise of powers not granted to it, the States who are parties to the compact have the right, and are in duty bound, to interpose for arresting the progress of the evil, and for maintaining, within their respective limits, the authorities, rights, and liberties appertaining to them;

That failure on the part of this State thus to assert its clear rights would be construed as acquiescence in the surrender thereof, and that such submissive acquiescence to the seizure of one right would in the end lead to the surrender of all rights, and inevitably to the consolidation of the States into one sovereignty, contrary to the sacred compact by which this Union of States was created;

That the question of contested power asserted in this resolution is not within the province of the Court to determine because the Court itself seeks to usurp the powers which have been reserved to the States, and, therefore, under these circumstances, the judgment of all of the parties to the compact must be sought to resolve the question; that the Supreme Court is not a party to this compact, but a creature of the compact, and the question of contested power cannot be settled by the creature seeking to usurp the power, but by the parties to the compact who are the people of the respective States in whom ultimate sovereignty finally reposes; be it further

Resolved, That in order that relief be obtained and the wrongs and injuries inflicted be alleviated, we invite all of our sister States to join in taking such steps as are necessary to settle the grave question of contested sovereignty herein raised; the State of Mississippi declares that the Congress has the duty and authority to protect the rights of the States from the unwarranted encroachment upon their reserved powers to govern the internal and domestic affairs of the States; the State of Mississippi further asserts that the Congress has, on many occasions in the past, curbed the attempted encroachment by the judiciary upon the legislative and executive branches of government, and it is the responsibility of the Congress likewise to protect the States when their constitutional rights and privileges are endangered.

The State of Mississippi declares emphatically that the sovereign States of the Nation have never surrendered their rights and powers to control their public schools, colleges, and other public institutions; therefore, when an attempt is made to usurp these powers, the people of Mississippi object and refuse to be so deprived, reminding the Congress that the preservation of this Union of States, as the compact intended it should be, depends upon the preservation of the sovereignty of the States.

The compact intended ours to be a Government of the people, for the people, and above all, a Government by the people; if the right to govern and control the local affairs to decide questions of public health, morals, education, and safety are taken from the States, then a fatal blow has been dealt State sovereignty and the States are nothing more than vassal provinces, subject to a Central Government.

The State of Mississippi declares that it is the duty and privilege of a State to object to the aforesaid invasion of its rights and does hereby interpose its sovereignty to protect these rights; it is the duty of the Congress to halt such practices and save these rights; and if such cannot be obtained other than by amendment to the Federal Constitution, we appeal to the Congress, in the exercise of the power granted under article 5 of the Constitution, to initiate and submit an appropriate amendment direct to the 48 States for ratification by three-fourths of the legislatures thereof, declaring that the States have never surrendered their rights and powers to control their public schools, colleges, and other public institutions and facilities to the Federal Government, or any department or agency thereof, but such powers are reserved to the States; and until such time as these wrongs are righted, we do hereby declare the decisions and order of the Supreme Court of the United States of May 17, 1954, and May 31, 1955, to be a usurpation of power reserved to the several States and do declare, as a matter of right, that said decisions are in violation of the Constitution of the United States and the State of Mississippi, and therefore, are considered unconstitutional, invalid and of no lawful effect within the confines of the State of Mississippi.

We declare, further, our firm intention to take all appropriate measures honorably and constitutionally available to us, to void this illegal encroachment upon our rights, and we do hereby urge our sister States to take prompt and deliberate action to check further encroachment by the Federal Government, through judicial legislation, upon the reserved powers of all States.

The Governor of Mississippi is respectfully requested to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Governor of each of the other States, and to the Members of Congress and the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

Resolutions of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress and the Secretary of Defense to prevent the reduction of production and personnel at the Watertown Arsenal

"Whereas the present administration plan is to reduce the production and personnel of the \$100 million ordnance plant, Watertown Arsenal, in Watertown, Mass.; and

"Whereas the members of the house of representatives believe in industrial preparedness for modern war with the most scientific weapons to maintain peace in these times; and

"Whereas the Department of Defense is giving important guided-missile and new-weapons work to private industrial firms which do not have the know-how, adding additional tax burden to American citizens; and

"Whereas Watertown Arsenal and the New England area is noted for its skilled artisans, technicians and scientific personnel and is the center of the world's greatest concentration of electronic educational and training facilities; and

"Whereas the loss of the \$15 million annual payroll of Watertown Arsenal in this area would drastically add to the economic plight of an already injured New England economy; and

"Whereas the present and proposed future cutbacks in work at Watertown Arsenal is already harming and will further economically damage the small-business structure in New England; and

"Whereas Watertown Arsenal is capable and ready to produce guided missiles and the new family of defense weapons; and

"Whereas the skill of the scientists and technicians at the Watertown Arsenal, who have pioneered in major metallurgical and scientific developments for decades, have won national and international acclaim; and

"Whereas the dissipation of these highly skilled ordnance artisans and workers during these uncertain times will work to the detriment of the defense of the Nation as a whole; and

"Whereas the house of representatives find irreconcilable an increased national defense budget request in the billions for the coming fiscal year, while being without any production planning and intelligent utilization for Watertown Arsenal's \$100 million modernized plant, machine tools, foundry, assembly buildings and laboratories with the finest scientific testing equipment, staff, skills, and know-how; and

"Whereas the house of representatives find it unreasonable to all the people of the United States, who are taxpayers, the ignoring and sinking of vital ordnance plants in New England: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of Massachusetts urgently requests that the Congress of the United States take such action as may be necessary to prevent the reduction of production and personnel at the Watertown Arsenal; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of Defense rescind any order or plan to reduce production and personnel at the vitally important Watertown Arsenal ordnance installation, and provide it with work in the guided-missile and new-weapons field from already appropriated funds of the defense budget, thus working for the best interest of the United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of Defense to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth."

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE— PROCLAMATIONS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, two proclamations issued in Boston, Mass., on the occasion of the 38th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

There being no objection, the proclamations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION BY HIS EXCELLENCY CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, GOVERNOR, THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Whereas the Lithuanian Taryba in Vilna on February 16, 1918, proclaimed to the world in the oldest living European language the rebirth of a free and independent Lithuania after 120 years of Russian occupation; and

Whereas Lithuania during a score of years of independence demonstrated her ability to advance, grow and prosper, and to become an active member of the League of Nations; and

Whereas the people of Lithuanian origin or descent have helped this country to establish its independence and then contributed their share in the development of its natural resources, industry, and life; and

Whereas Lithuania with her sister republics of Latvia and Estonia were the first to disappear behind the Iron Curtain and to suffer and expose the aggressive imperialism of Soviet Russia and thus to apprise the world of the aims and technique of communism; and

Whereas this country has demonstrated our sincere devotion to freedom, liberty, and justice by not recognizing the Communist occupation of Lithuania and most recently in the message of President Eisenhower to Bulganin that the enslaved people should be freed for genuine world peace; and

Whereas the United States Government continues to recognize the Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary and the consuls of the Republic of Lithuania and to assure the brave Lithuanian people that they are not alone in their struggle against communism.

Now, therefore, I, Christian A. Herter, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, being mindful of the respect and sympathy of our citizens for the people of Lithuania, do hereby designate and proclaim Thursday, February 16, 1956, as Republic of Lithuania Day in Massachusetts, and I do hereby request all people of this Commonwealth to join with our neighbors of Lithuanian ancestry and descent in the hope and prayer that liberty and freedom will again be theirs to celebrate on independence day with its complete connotation and glory.

Given at the executive chamber in Boston, this 8th day of February, in the year of our Lord 1956, and of the independence of the United States of America, the 180th.

By His Excellency the Governor:

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
EDWARD J. CRONIN,

Secretary of the Commonwealth.

PROCLAMATION—REPUBLIC OF LITHUANIA DAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1956

A year ago today, it was my pleasure as mayor of the city of Boston to issue a proclamation on the occasion of the 37th anniversary of the independence of Lithuania.

On that occasion I noted the tragic facts of the oppression and incorporation of Lithuania into the orbit of Soviet imperialism.

As we recall the early history of our own country, our experiences were similar. Yet, however great were the hardships of our forebears, how enduring and trying their sufferings, the knowledge that at one time

America would be free and a fine country to live in, was never lost from mind.

On this 38th anniversary of Lithuania's independence there is little cause for rejoicing or celebration, but every Lithuanian may recall with pride the glories of Lithuania during the middle ages and under Vytautas, they were the foremost state of all Europe. No people in all the world have ever given more convincing evidence of their capacity for successful self-government than the people of Lithuania following their independence 38 years ago.

One may be sure that the brave people of Lithuania are determined that they shall not be subjugated. We pay deserved tribute today to these Lithuanians whose perseverance and continued resistance to communism will one day restore their homeland to the status of a free and independent nation.

Now, therefore, I, John B. Hynes, mayor of the city of Boston, do hereby proclaim the 16th day of February 1956, to be Republic of Lithuania Day and urge the citizens of the city of Boston to cooperate in the observance of this occasion.

JOHN B. HYNES,
Mayor of Boston.

Attest:

WALTER J. MALLOY,
City Clerk.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 572. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Delio A. Loo Murgas (Rept. No. 1610);

S. 1240. A bill for the relief of Imre de Cholnoky (Rept. No. 1611);

S. 1701. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Silvonon (Rept. No. 1612);

S. 1733. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Argasinski (Rept. No. 1613);

S. 1900. A bill for the relief of Helen Agnes Blais (Junko Furakawa) (Rept. No. 1616);

S. 2103. A bill for the relief of Anke Naber (Rept. No. 1617);

S. 2243. A bill for the relief of Mary Boone Lacson (Rept. No. 1618);

S. 2327. A bill for the relief of Takako Iba (Rept. No. 1619);

S. 2371. A bill for the relief of Charles Black, also known as Joseph Clark (Rept. No. 1620);

S. 2381. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mahmood Sajjadi (Rept. No. 1621);

S. 2399. A bill for the relief of Hua-Tung Lee (Gordon Lee) and his wife, Chi-Wan Mow Lee (Jane Lee) (Rept. No. 1622);

S. 2414. A bill for the relief of Lina Diaz (Rept. No. 1623); and

H. R. 3037. An act for the relief of Jakob Hass, Roza Hass, and Mala Hass (Rept. No. 1615).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 1762. A bill for the relief of Rudolf Fritz Liermann (Rept. No. 1614).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Richard H. Levet, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York, vice John C. Knox; and

Justin C. Morgan, of New York, to be United States district judge for the western district of New York, vice John Knight.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 3351. A bill for the relief of Yamato Masatsugu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENDER, Mr. PURTELL, and Mr. BUSH):

S. 3352. A bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ives when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 3353. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property of the United States to the village of Carey, Ohio; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 3354. A bill for the relief of Jelena Simicevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 3355. A bill to authorize loans to owners of housing accommodations on farms for the purpose of assisting in the acquisition of adequate facilities for providing and using water in such accommodations; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DANIEL (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas):

S. 3356. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Navy or his designee to convey a 240.55-acre tract of land situated near the city of Grand Prairie, in Dallas County, Tex., to the State of Texas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 3357. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain property located at Boston Neck, Narragansett, Washington County, R. I., to the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 3358. A bill for the relief of Hewey Malachi Mackey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 3359. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marjore Collins; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. KERR):

S. 3360. A bill to provide for the transfer of a certain tract of land to the Secretary of the Army for use as a part of the Fort Sill Military Reservation, Fort Sill, Okla.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 3361. A bill for the relief of Egbert Carlsson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 3362. A bill to simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3363. A bill for the relief of Miroslav Slovak; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 3364. A bill for the relief of Roberto Mario Bettinzoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3365. A bill to amend section 410 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to change the requirements for obtaining a freight-forwarder permit;

S. 3366. A bill to amend section 409 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to authorize contracts between freight forwarders and railroads for the movement of trailers on flatcars; and

S. 3367. A bill to amend section 411 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, with respect to relationships between freight forwarders and other common carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DISPOSITION OF FEDERALLY OWNED LANDS FOR AGRICULTURAL PURPOSES

Mr. CAPEHART submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 224), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolved, That it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Senate (A) that after the date on which this resolution is agreed to, no agreement shall be entered into by any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government for the rental or leasing of any lands under its jurisdiction to any private person, association, or corporation, if such lands are to be used by such person, association, or corporation for any agricultural purpose, except grazing, and (B) that when any department, agency, or instrumentality of the Federal Government has lands under its jurisdiction which are in excess to its needs and which are suitable for agricultural use, such lands should be disposed of in accordance with the existing laws providing for the disposition of federally owned real property.

FEDERAL EQUAL PAY ACT

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], and the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH and Mr. PURTELL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be kept on the desk until next Monday—1 week—in order that any Senator who may care to associate himself as a sponsor may have that opportunity.

This bill provides that a man and a woman who perform the same work, or comparable work, in the same establishment must be paid at the same rate, taking into consideration performance and length of service. President Eisenhower in his state of the Union message on January 5 of this year stated:

Legislation to apply the principle of equal pay for equal work without discrimination because of sex is a matter of simple justice.

This bill is designed to carry out this recommendation of the President to the Congress.

Although many States, including my own, have enacted equal pay legislation, a substantial number of States have failed to do so. The establishment by the Congress of the United States of equal pay legislation would serve as a

guide to all employers throughout the country. Women workers, who constitute almost one-third of the labor force in the United States, would be the principal beneficiaries. Moreover, the provisions of this bill would not affect collective bargaining in any way, but would merely protect female employees against wage discrimination.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, the text of the bill and a short explanation of its provisions.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3352) to prohibit discrimination on account of sex in the payment of wages by employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and to provide procedures for assisting employees in collecting wages lost by reason of any such discrimination, introduced by Mr. Ives (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Federal Equal Pay Act."

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds that the existence in industries engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce of wage differentials based on sex—

(1) depresses wages and living standards of employees necessary for their health and efficiency;

(2) prevents the maximum utilization of the available labor resources;

(3) tends to cause labor disputes, thereby burdening, affecting, and obstructing commerce;

(4) burdens commerce and the free flow of goods in commerce;

(5) constitutes an unfair method of competition.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this act, through the exercise by Congress of its power to regulate commerce among the several States and with foreign nations, to correct the conditions above referred to in such industries.

PROHIBITION OF WAGE-RATE DIFFERENTIAL BASED ON SEX

SEC. 3. No employer having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce shall discriminate, in any place of employment in which his employees are so engaged, between employees on the basis of sex by paying wages to any employee at a rate less than the rate at which he pays wages to employees of the opposite sex for work of comparable character on jobs the performance of which requires comparable skills, except where such payment is made pursuant to a seniority or merit increase system which does not discriminate on the basis of sex.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 4. (a) The Secretary—

(1) shall prescribe such regulations as he deems necessary and appropriate for the administration of this act, including regulations to provide standards for determining work of comparable character on jobs the performance of which requires comparable skills; and

(2) may investigate and gather data regarding the wages, hours, and other conditions and practices of employment in any

industry subject to this act, and may enter and inspect such places and such records (and make such transcriptions thereof), question such employees, and investigate such facts, conditions, practices, and matters as he may deem necessary or appropriate to determine whether any person has violated any provision of this act, or which may aid in the enforcement of the provisions of this act; and

(3) shall bring all actions under section 9 to restrain violations of this act. Attorneys appointed by, or under the authority of, the Secretary may appear for and represent the Secretary in any litigation but all such litigation shall be subject to the direction and control of the Attorney General.

(b) For the purpose of any hearing or investigation provided for in this act, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., 1952 edition, title 15, secs. 49 and 50), are hereby made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Secretary.

WAGE RESTITUTION AND LIQUIDATED DAMAGES

SEC. 5. Any employer who violates section 3 of this act shall be liable to each employee affected in the amount of the wages of which such employee is deprived by reason of such violation, and in an additional equal amount as liquidated damages: *Provided*, That in any action brought under section 6 (a) to recover such unpaid wages, if the employer shows to the satisfaction of the court that the act or omission giving rise to such action was in good faith and that he had reasonable grounds for believing that his act or omission was not a violation of section 3, the court may, in its sound discretion, award no liquidated damages or award any amount thereof not to exceed the amount specified in this section.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 6. (a) Action to recover any amount for which an employer is liable under section 5 may be maintained in any court of competent jurisdiction by any one or more affected employees for and in behalf of himself or themselves and other employees similarly situated. No employee shall be a party plaintiff to any such action unless he has given his consent in writing to become such a party and such consent is filed in the court in which such action is brought. The court in such action shall, in addition to any judgment awarded to the plaintiff or plaintiffs, allow a reasonable attorney's fee to be paid by the defendant, and costs of the action.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to supervise the payment of any amounts of unpaid wages for which an employer is liable under section 5, and the agreement of any employee to accept such payment shall upon payment in full constitute a waiver by such employee of any right of action he may have under subsection (a) to recover such amounts and any additional amount as liquidated damages. When a written request is filed by any employee with the Secretary claiming any amount as unpaid wages owing under section 5, the Secretary may bring an action in any court of competent jurisdiction to recover such amount. The consent of any employee to the bringing of any such action by the Secretary, unless such action is dismissed without prejudice on motion of the Secretary, shall constitute a waiver by such employee of any right of action he may have with respect to the claim and any additional amount as liquidated damages under subsection (a). Any sums recovered by the Secretary on behalf of an employee in an action brought under this subsection shall be held in a special deposit account and shall be paid, on order of the Secretary, directly to the employee. Any such sums not paid to an employee because of inability to do so within a period of 3 years shall be covered into the

Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

(c) Any action commenced under this section shall be barred unless commenced within 2 years after the cause of action accrues.

POSTING

SEC. 7. A copy of this act or, if approved by the Secretary, a poster explaining its provisions shall be displayed conspicuously by every employer in each place of employment in which he employs any employees to whom this act applies.

UNLAWFUL DISCHARGE OR DISCRIMINATION; PENALTIES

SEC. 8. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to discharge or in any other manner discriminate against any employee because such employee has filed any complaint or instituted any proceeding under this act, or has testified or is about to testify in any such proceeding, or has furnished information or is about to furnish information in connection with the enforcement of this act.

(b) Any person who willfully violates the provisions of subsection (a) shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 6 months, or both; but no person shall be imprisoned under this section except for an offense committed after the conviction of such person for a prior offense under this subsection.

(c) The United States district courts, together with the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and the District Court of Guam, shall have jurisdiction of criminal proceedings for violations of this section.

INJUNCTION PROCEEDINGS

SEC. 9. The United States district courts, together with the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and the District Court of Guam, shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, to restrain violations of section 3, section 7, or section 8, or any of the provisions of the regulations of the Secretary issued under section 4.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 10. As used in this act—

(a) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Labor, United States Department of Labor.

(b) "Person" means an individual, partnership, association, corporation, business trust, legal representative, or any organized group of persons.

(c) "Commerce" means trade, commerce, transportation, transmission, or communication among the several States or between any State and any place outside thereof.

(d) "State" means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the outer Continental Shelf describe in Public Law 212, 83d Congress (67 Stat. 462), or any Territory or possession subject to the exercise by the United States of sovereign rights, powers, or authority.

(e) "Employer" includes any person acting directly or indirectly in the interest of an employer in relation to an employee but shall not include the United States or any State or political subdivision of a State, or any labor organization (other than when acting as an employer), or anyone acting in the capacity of officer or agent of such labor organization.

(f) "Employee" includes any individual employed by an employer.

(g) "Employ" includes to suffer or permit to work.

(h) "Goods" means goods (including ships and marine equipment), wares, products, commodities, merchandise, or articles or subjects of commerce of any character, or any part or ingredient thereof, but does not include goods after their delivery

into the actual physical possession of the ultimate consumer thereof other than a producer, manufacturer, or processor thereof.

(i) "Produced" means produced, manufactured, mined, handled, or in any other manner worked on in any State; and for the purposes of this act an employer shall be deemed to have been engaged in the production of goods if such employee was employed in producing, manufacturing, mining, handling, transporting, or in any other manner working on such goods, or in any closely related process or occupation directly essential to the production thereof, in any State.

(j) "Wage" paid to any employee includes the reasonable cost, as determined by the Secretary to the employer of furnishing such employee with board, lodging, or other facilities, if such board, lodging, or other facilities are customarily furnished by such employer to his employees.

APPROPRIATION

SEC. 11. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 12. This act shall take effect 120 days after the date of enactment.

The statement and analysis, presented by Mr. IVES, is as follows:

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF PROVIDING EQUAL PAY WITHOUT DISCRIMINATION ON ACCOUNT OF SEX IN INTERSTATE EMPLOYMENT

The purpose of this proposal is to provide a means within the scope of the Federal regulatory power to eliminate discrimination in wage rates based on sex where men and women are performing comparable work for the same employer.

The proposal would apply to employers whose employees are engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for interstate commerce. The administration of the act would be vested in the Secretary of Labor and procedures of enforcement and wage collection authorized similar to these now utilized by the Department of Labor in the administration of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

The payment of lower wage rates to workers of one sex for the same or comparable work as that performed by the other sex has an undesirable effect on the economic life of the entire Nation. Such practices tend to affect adversely the general purchasing power and the standards of living of workers. Unfair competitive advantages are enjoyed by employers who pay discriminatory wage rates based on sex. In addition to the tangible economic ills caused by discriminatory wage practices, such practices violate fundamental principles of justice and impair the prestige of the United States in international affairs.

A nondiscriminatory wage level makes possible the maximum utilization of worker skills. This, together with collateral benefits, such as morale improvement, may stimulate production and lessen the effects of unfair competition.

It is of great importance that Congress eradicate discriminatory pay practices in interstate commerce.

EQUAL PAY PROPOSAL—SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1: Title of act: Establishes short title of Federal Equal Pay Act.

Section 2: Findings and declaration of policy: Enumerates undesirable conditions in interstate commerce resulting from payment of wage differentials based on sex and intention of Congress to correct such conditions.

Section 3: Prohibition of wage rate differential based on sex: Prohibits employers having employees engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce from discriminating on the basis of sex, in payment

of wages in any place of employment in which their employees are so engaged. The language descriptive of proposed coverage and the supporting definitions in section 10 are phrased to make available precedents established under the Fair Labor Standards Act in determining coverage under the proposed legislation.

Section 4: Administration: Authorizes the Secretary of Labor to issue rules and regulations, make investigations regarding compliance with the act, issue subpoenas, and restrain violations. These provisions are largely adapted from similar provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Section 5: Wage restitution and liquidated damages: Provides that employers who violate the act shall be liable for wages for which an employee is deprived and for not more than an additional equal amount as liquidated damages. The liability in employee suits for unpaid wages and liquidated damages is like that now provided by the Fair Labor Standards Act, as modified by section 11 of the Portal-to-Portal Act.

Section 6: Enforcement: Authorizes employee suits to recover amount of employer liability under section 5. Authorizes Secretary to supervise payment of wages withheld in violation of the act and to bring suits for such wages in behalf of employees upon their request. The recovery of unpaid wages, but not liquidated damages, is authorized in suits by the Secretary of Labor or by administrative action in supervising employer payments. Establishes a 2-year period of limitation for commencing recovery action after cause accrues.

Section 7: Posting: Requires employer to post copy of act or official poster explaining its provisions in each place of employment where act applies.

Section 8: Unlawful discharge or discrimination and penalties: Makes its unlawful willfully to discharge or discriminate against any employee assisting in the enforcement of the act. Upon a second conviction for such discharge, or discrimination, imposes a criminal penalty. Provides that the United States district courts will have jurisdiction of criminal proceedings for violation of this section.

Section 9: Injunction proceedings: Provides that the United States district courts will have jurisdiction to restrain violations of the act or regulations issued under it.

Section 10: Definitions: Defines terms used in the act principally as defined in the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Section 11: Appropriation: Authorizes necessary appropriations to carry out act.

Section 12: Effective date: Provides that act will take effect 120 days after passage.

SIMPLIFICATION OF FEDERAL ACCOUNTING

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes. The proposed legislation implements two of the second Hoover Commission's recommendations relating to the governmental budget and accounting.

This bill would expedite the payment of delayed bills where appropriations have lapsed, and improve the Government's accounting and reporting system.

It would authorize the various agencies of Government to pay undisputed bills chargeable to expired and lapsed appropriations in precisely the same manner as bills payable from currently

available appropriations. This will be accomplished by repealing existing requirements that all obligations chargeable to lapsed appropriations, shall be certified by the General Accounting Office, in advance of payment as legally due and payable from the lapsed appropriations; by permitting agencies on an indefinite basis to retain obligated balances of all appropriations made to them; and by specifically granting authority to the agencies to pay prior year obligations, from the retained balances through regular disbursing channels. These payments would be audited by the General Accounting Office.

As a result of the changes proposed by the bill, the General Accounting Office would discontinue the maintenance of approximately 35,000 detailed ledger accounts which are largely duplicative of accounting records also required to be maintained in the several agencies. Professional claims adjudicators and supporting personnel now utilized by General Accounting Office in reexamining and certifying for payment bills which previously have been examined and acknowledged by the agencies concerned, as due and payable, will be available for assignment to more productive endeavors.

Mr. President, I am assured, if enacted into law, this bill will make possible substantial savings in manpower and administrative expenses, modernize Government accounting, and effectuate the Hoover Commission recommendations in this important area.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3362) to simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. COTTON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956—AMENDMENTS

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. ANDERSON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MURRAY (for Mr. KEFAUVER) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by Mr. KEFAUVER to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CAPEHART submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 3183, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

**FEDERAL ELECTIONS ACT OF 1956—
ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF
BILL**

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of February 28, 1956,

The names of Mr. COTTON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. BUSH, Mr. IVES, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. BEALL, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. DUFF, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. THYE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. MALONE, Mr. WILEY, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. WELKER, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. MARTIN of Iowa, and Mr. MCCARTHY were added as cosponsors to the bill (S. 3308), to revise the Federal election laws, to prevent corrupt practices in Federal elections, to permit deductions for Federal income tax purposes of certain political contributions, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and other Senators) on February 28, 1956.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I should like to address the Senate for 2 minutes, under the 2-minute rule.

Mr. President, I am happy to join with the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] and the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], as well as many other Members of the Senate, in sponsoring the bill (S. 3308) to strengthen our Federal election laws.

I believe it has become increasingly apparent that our existing election laws are antiquated in many respects; and the inadequacy of these laws has been of considerable concern to me. I am gratified to see in the proposed law a provision for complete accounting by Federal candidates of their campaign contributions and their expenditures, as well as a requirement that large contributors make an accurate and complete report of their contributions.

Although the campaigns in my State do not usually result in the expenditure of large sums of money, I think the provision of the bill establishing a more realistic spending limit is of very real importance to candidates seeking election from the more populous States. I believe small campaign contributors should be encouraged to aid the candidates of their choice, and I am glad to see in the bill provisions to make their help more possible.

But, Mr. President, I have noticed that there is considerable conflict between the election laws of many States and the proposed Federal election law, in respect to the expenditures made by candidates for Federal office. I hope that in the development of the hearings on this bill, some attention will be paid to these conflicts and variations. Although I realize that we cannot legislate State laws on the floor of the national Congress, I hope that before this bill is finally enacted, we may appropriately call this problem to the attention of the various State legislatures. Certainly a candidate should

not be placed in the position of operating with the sanction of one set of laws, although being in jeopardy under a separate and different set of laws.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope it will be possible for the Congress to suggest the development of a uniform State law which will be more or less in conformity with whatever law the Congress passes.

For this reason and others, Mr. President, I am happy to join in sponsoring this bill.

**NATIONAL CIVIL AIR PATROL DAY—
ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF
JOINT RESOLUTION**

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of February 29, 1956,

The names of Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. POTTER, Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. KUCHEL were added as additional cosponsors to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 151) to authorize the President to proclaim December 1 of each year as National Civil Air Patrol Day, introduced by Mr. FREAR (for himself and other Senators), on February 29, 1956.

**PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT
ON LAKE CHAUTAUQUA AND CHA-
DAKON RIVER, JAMESTOWN, N. Y.
(S. DOC. NO. 103)**

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated June 23, 1955, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of report on Lake Chautauqua and Chadakoin River, Jamestown, N. Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works adopted on June 17, 1942. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with an illustration, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**REPORT OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT
CENTENNIAL COMMISSION (S.
DOC. NO. 102)**

Mr. O'MAHER. Mr. President, earlier today the Acting President pro tempore laid before the Senate the report of the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission for the Celebration in 1958 of the One Hundredth Anniversary of Theodore Roosevelt. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTI-
CLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE
RECORD**

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc.,

were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KENNEDY:

Statement prepared by him relating to conditions in Poland.

By Mr. LANGER:

Article entitled " 'Bensonomics' Is Blasted by High-Support Senator," written by Senator ELLENDER, and published in the Washington Sunday Star of March 4, 1956.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Address entitled "Freedom of Choice in Public Schools," delivered by Robert B. Troutman before the Rotary Club, of Atlanta, Ga., and printed in the Christian Science Monitor of March 1, 1956.

**ANCHER NELSEN, ADMINISTRATOR
OF THE REA**

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, on February 8 the senior Senator from Montana offered for the RECORD an article from the Nashville Tennessean purporting to show evidence of pressure on members of the resolutions committee of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

This article does a serious injustice to a Federal official, Ancher Nelsen, who, as Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, is doing an outstanding job. That is not merely my opinion, but it is the opinion of many people who have had a long and close association with the REA program, and who are intimately familiar with its operations.

On February 27, the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] presented evidence which bears out the fact that Mr. Nelsen was unjustly and falsely accused. I can present additional evidence that such is the case.

One of my constituents who was present and active at the meeting described in the newspaper article previously referred to has sent me a copy of a letter he has written to Mr. Nelsen. What he said in the letter is extremely illuminating. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 9, 1956.

Mr. ANCHER NELSEN,
Administrator, United States Department of Agriculture, Rural Electrification, Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. NELSON: As the vice chairman of the resolutions committee of the NRECA 1956 annual meeting, I cannot tell you how shocked I was to read the article that appeared in the Nashville Tennessean on January 29.

I have been a member of this committee for the past 2 years and believe I know something about the committee's way of operation and general attitudes. I must say that the picture reflected in the newspaper surprised me. It certainly does not represent what I believe to be fact.

My first reason for this belief is that it was the majority of the committee that asked you to appear before us to answer any questions any member of the committee might have. I was present, I believe, during the times you faced the resolutions committee while in session in St. Louis and know first hand what took place. It is my opinion we were after the facts, those that we could get from you

as well as those we could get from others. I feel that if in our deliberations our conclusions are not reached with proper facts, we would not be doing justice to our responsibilities.

The newspaper writer includes this quotation: "He knew some of our committee members had loan applications before him and he wished to argue with us about each issue that might come up. We didn't give him the chance. Nobody before had ever asked such a chance."

I cannot say this quotation is in error, but I can say it is far from the facts. The facts that you offered your cooperation to your fullest extent and informed the committee that you would be available any time they wished to call you back. I am sure the committee as a whole were more than pleased to have you available any time they had a problem you could assist them with.

During the 2 years I have served on the committee, it has been the policy of the committee to request anyone to appear before them to answer questions or to clarify problems the committee might have. This has been a great assistance to the committee in the past 2 years and has greatly assisted in preparing good resolutions.

I note in the above-mentioned article there is an attempt by the writer to show your appearance is unprecedented. I again say your appearance was by request of the majority of the committee not only this year but last year as well. I cannot speak as to previous years but I do wonder how this committee functioned in an intellegent manner if it did not seek information from expert authorities prior to their composition of resolutions proposed for adoption on a national scale.

Very truly yours,
WOLVERINE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE,
JOHN N. KEEN, *Manger*.

HIRING OF BRAUN & CO. AS CONSULTANT FOR REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, my attention has recently been called to a statement made by Mr. T. W. Braun, president of Braun & Co., a Los Angeles public-relations firm.

On the pending farm bill, there are honest differences of opinion. However, an attack was recently made on certain individuals who have rendered public service with relation to the pending legislation. For that reason, I desire that the record be correct.

In the course of debate, it was stated that Braun & Co. was under indictment in Texas. That is incorrect. The case was a conventional antitrust case, and I am informed a Department of Justice official stated that Braun & Co. was named only as an alleged conspirator in the case, and was not named as a defendant.

I am also informed that the indictment was later dismissed by the Government, and a so-called "information" was substituted.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a telegram sent to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], by Braun & Co., signed by T. W. Braun, president.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Reference your remarks about Secretary of Agriculture Benson and Braun & Co. in the Senate, March 1.

If you had checked the whole record you would have found that we have worked for the Government on a nonpartisan and public-service basis in various ways since 1941.

My last effort under a Democratic administration was as a consultant in the executive office of the President in 1950. I was a member of the staff which studied and reported to the President on foreign economic policies.

In terms of solid assistance to American farmers, we are proud to match our record against political smears and character assassinations.

For over 20 years one of our principal activities has been in the field of increasing sales and consumption of farm products, especially those in surplus.

Beginning in 1936, we played a leading part in developing the producer-consumer campaign idea. Since then about 300 promotions have been conducted on such products as citrus fruits, apples, pears, peaches, cherries, lettuce, cabbage, potatoes, dairy products, and meat. In 1954 alone, 28 farm items were given national promotion to increase consumption of foods in heavy supply.

Our client, Safeway Stores, Inc., was one of the leaders in an expenditure by food chains alone of about \$12½ million advertising fresh beef in a recent drive on that product. The results in increase consumption were spectacular and in the neighborhood of 18 pounds per capita.

Similar campaigns have been undertaken to increase the consumption of the large pork supplies which began moving to market last fall. Increases in sales of over 15 percent represent further solid accomplishments.

Although our 90-day agreement with the Republican National Committee terminated Tuesday, February 28, we have not "folded our tents." We established an office in Washington, D. C., in the National Press Building, in 1943. That office is still there.

This firm and I will continue to be available for public service whenever responsible officers of the Government think there is anything which we can contribute.

BRAUN & CO.,
T. W. BRAUN, *President*.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I believe that at the same time it should be noted that the Associated Press was credited with a story in the Washington Post and Times Herald of yesterday, Sunday March 4, in which it was stated that Mr. Braun said, in a statement to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], that he was a consultant in the executive office of the President in 1950 on foreign economic problems. Mr. Truman was in office at that time. So that Mr. Braun apparently has been a consultant in this field for some time.

Mr. BRIDGES. And he rendered nonpartisan service. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his information.

Mr. President, I should like to address myself to another subject.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire has the floor.

REORGANIZATION OF THE PASSPORT OFFICE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to express my personal observations on the reor-

ganization of the Passport Office. This agency of the Government has a history of good public service. Over the years, the employees of the Passport Office have shown themselves to be dedicated public servants, with a highly developed sense of duty, courtesy, and patience.

With the impact of greatly increased overseas travel by American citizens, the Passport Office struggled through one of the most difficult and trying periods of its history during the summer and fall of 1955. It lacked equipment, personnel, and space. The situation would have demoralized a staff with less stamina. But with its reorganization and new quarters and improved facilities, it has been revitalized, and today I venture to say that the Passport Office is on its way to becoming one of the outstanding examples of good management and administration in the Federal Government.

I congratulate Miss Knight, and the three Federal Agencies—the General Accounting Office, the General Services Administration, and the Civil Service Commission—for a splendid example which they have established for the record to prove that a Government office, such as the Passport Office, can be modernized, reorganized, and improved without excessive costs and delays for long-winded studies, research, and conferences.

MR. PAUL BUTLER'S CAMPAIGN STRATEGY

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I have been amazed at the savage way that Mr. Paul Butler, Democratic National Chairman, has started the Democratic campaign. Let alone whether it is in good taste, I do not think it is smart politics for the Democratic chairman to launch his attack upon the fact that President Eisenhower had a coronary from which the doctors say he has made a good recovery—no, Mr. President, not while people still thrill to the words "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself," which came from a man who, whatever one may think of his political philosophy, had gone through the fears and the crippling experience of polio, and came back, unafraid, to be President of the United States for a longer period of time than any other man in history.

Mr. President, I recall seeing Franklin D. Roosevelt, when President, grip the sides of the Speaker's stand to relieve the weight on his braced legs while he made stirring speeches to both Houses of the Congress—yes, even a speech calling for a declaration of war, to which the American people responded with everything they had.

Undeniably, Mr. Roosevelt had a severe attack of polio, crippling and limiting in its effect on the physical and nervous system. Undeniably, Mr. Eisenhower had a heart attack. But as I listened to him the other night, I thought one would not even need to be objective to say, "Here is a man completely dedicated to the service of his country and unafraid. The confidence in his voice and the candor of his words have again given the world the reassurance so much needed for the chartless days in which we live."

Mr. President, it is my prediction that the American people want the hand of this courageous but humble and devout man at the helm of the ship of state for another 4 years. It is my prediction that any campaign against Mr. Eisenhower, based on the fact that he once had a heart attack, will be as self-defeating as would have been a campaign against Mr. Roosevelt on the ground that he could only be a part-time President.

SENATOR GORE OF TENNESSEE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, an article entitled "Realistic Reformer From Tennessee," written by William S. White, chief congressional correspondent of the New York Times, and published in the New York Times magazine on March 4, 1956. I think the article is worthy of the consideration of every Member of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON.—To one of the last Southern Puritans, a nonsmokin', noncussin', non-drinkin' Democrat called ALBERT GORE, has been entrusted in an election year an extraordinary but very real abstraction: the conscience of the United States Senate.

Senator GORE is the outstanding figure on the bipartisan Select Senate Committee of eight that is charged with making what could be the most far-reaching investigation in history into lobbying, questionable campaign contributions, and all forms of political corruption.

Will he do a good job?

Almost certainly, yes.

Will the television shriek by day and night and will the newspaper headlines howl?

Very probably, no.

Will witnesses and accused be drawn upon the rack, and will this be a kind of a kleiglit contest between the good guys and the bad guys? Will it promote the devil theory of politics?

Almost certainly, no.

Will it all produce a third presidential or vice presidential possibility from the State of Tennessee—that is, will Senator Albert Gore join Senator Estes Kefauver, and Gov. Frank G. Clement as more or less shyly available?

Probably not.

For GORE, notwithstanding his smooth, neat, pallidly handsome face and his deeply conservative blue serge suits rather suggesting a mildly worldly young deacon, is no political parson, no hot-eyed St. George wildly and blindly swinging about among the dragons. He is a profoundly realistic politician whose mind is as hard as his manner is soft and, like all sensible politicians, he knows where the reformer's spirit may sensibly go and where it may not.

He is acutely aware that he has got hold of a job here that at best will hardly win him a popularity contest among politicians inside and outside the Senate and at worst might well present him as an unopposed candidate for nomination as the most obnoxious man in that famous institution.

He has not accepted the Senate's mandate merely to preside over the liquidation of its public character. Equally, he has not signed on to run an enterprise showing that everything is simply swell in the highly sensitive areas in which now he must fish.

It is GORE's quiet but quite firm determination, among other things, to run to cover a good deal of interstate campaign money that he deeply believes tends to subvert the essential democratic process.

In this he will express the accumulated and still accumulating wrath of many in Congress who do not at all like it when Texas or California oil millionaires, or Michigan motor millionaires—or labor's political action groups, either—find that civic duty requires them to put substantial sums not only into presidential elections and into the elections in their own States but also to range about other States with contributions against this or that Senate or House candidate.

He is not insensible to the plain if delicate fact, however, that in regard to campaign costs few men in the Senate are really islands unto themselves. He does not propose, therefore, to enter the business in the manner of Carrie Nation eagerly taking her hatchet into the saloons. He proposes not to attempt to prohibit but rather to expose, to limit and, therefore, to regulate contribution practices that cannot wholly be ended so long as Senate membership is to be open to those other than the very rich.

The personal character of the head of any Senate investigation is infinitely its most important and controlling factor, no matter what its mission, its rules, or its ultimate purpose. In this coming inquiry, going as it must into sticky matters of the Senate's relationship to lobbying, campaign spending, and all the rest, all this will be doubly true.

It thus follows that the personal character of ALBERT GORE becomes of the highest public significance. What of this character?

To begin with, he is a product of Carthage, Tenn., a community of some 2,000 citizens with a character of its own. Carthage's principal export in the commercial sense has for generations been tobacco, a world crop. And this perhaps explains why GORE, like his great idol from Carthage, Cordell Hull, a former Representative, a former Senator, and a former Secretary of State, has doggedly and always pursued the old-time Democratic ideal of something approaching free trade—low tariffs, and all that.

But Carthage's really vital export for many, many generations has been political leadership; this remote little town in the foothills of the Cumberland Mountains has sent out through the years an incredible number of Congressmen, Senators, Governors, Ambassadors, and Cabinet officers.

Where boys elsewhere want to get a job in the bank or own the furniture store and join the Rotary Club, those in Carthage consider the political career to be slightly more to be sought after than all these—or even the ministry, although in this Calvinist community the pulpit beckons strongly.

Moreover, this is a community that is Southern only in a sense; it was closely divided between pro-Yank and pro-Reb during the War Between the States and even now it is usually a 60 percent Democratic town rather than a 90 percent Democratic town.

This somewhat scrabbly hill country was and is no place of magnolia and moonlight, and GORE, unlike many of his southern colleagues, is neither attached to the past nor able to live the genteel political life of the chaps from the Delta and Tidewater South who are sometimes a bit vague about how they get elected and reelected. GORE has had to fight for his political preferment. This, as well as all the other intimate circumstances of his way of life, has made him a somewhat special kind of southern politician.

He is not a southern coalitionist, not noticeably or deeply worried over desegregation, not a conservative at all in the southern sense. Rather, he is on most issues what would be called both a liberal and truly partisan politician. He is a strong pro-public-power man, fighting with a calm remorselessness at every opportunity for the Tennessee Valley Authority and things of that sort.

It was GORE who actually prepared the bulk of the Democratic case against the Dixon-

Yates private power contract that at length was canceled by the President.

It was GORE who led the liberals in a filibuster a year or so ago against legislative proposals by the administration that seemed to them to give to private power companies altogether too great an entree to atomic energy.

He is one of a score of "Mr. RAYBURN's boys" who in their seasons have come up from the House of Representatives, so long dominated by the saturninely brilliant Speaker SAM RAYBURN of Texas, to give a new color and character to the Senate.

But, and this is a very important qualification, GORE, the liberal on many matters—as, for example, on price controls—is not a liberal on labor matters. Parenthetically, this explains the willingness of the Senate conservatives to accept him for the lobby investigation. They are in not the slightest doubt, just as most observers are not in the slightest doubt, that he will go after big labor just as he will big business.

All in all, therefore, this is the picture of basic character that emerges:

A highly correct man—although one capable of playing a fiddle to the crowd in his salad days as a campaigner for the House—but not a stuffy one. A country man, but a shrewd modern politician all the same, with rarely matched skill in sloganeering when it is needed.

A man long and truly and demonstrably devoted to the concept of clean politics who nevertheless approaches his task from a background of a strong, although personal and idealistic, machine of his own—a machine with which he defeated the tough, urban Memphis-machine of the late "Boss Ed" Crump in order to come to the Senate.

A man genuinely engaged in reform—but a man prepared to acknowledge, as he did in a leisurely interview with this correspondent, that "the flush of shame," as he put it, might well fall across his own cheek if he knew the details of some of the contributions that might have been made without his knowledge to his own various campaigns.

A man prepared to challenge heirarchy and all the entrenched political powers, in the Senate and outside—but sensibly prepared and not ready to carry any crusade so heedlessly far as to destroy it.

This latter point, indeed, is perhaps the most vital of all. A reformer's life is perhaps not easy anywhere; in the Senate it can be both bitter and fruitless, and nothing is so self-defeating as an excessive, untempered zeal.

Equally, the reformer there must so proceed and so behave as to leave no general suspicion that his motives are wholly or even predominantly those of mere self-advancement and self-advancement. GORE called off the atomic energy filibuster after 13 days and some hours for this reason. In the Dixon-Yates fight he avoided a too constant occupancy of the spotlight for the same reason.

He bitterly resents what he believes to be a general tax policy unfairly discriminatory in favor of business, but he does not carry his challenge to the conservatives past the point of no return.

He is, in sum, a reformer who is also a generally accepted Member of the Senate, whereas others, including his colleague Senator KEFAUVER, tend to put up the senatorial back.

One recalls him during the 1954 congressional campaign politely rejecting a glass of beer in a hotel room in New Mexico as rather too alcoholic a draught. Thus, it is hardly an overstatement to say that he is not a convivial man. All the same, he is anything but a prig, even though one recalls hearing not so much as a muttered "damn" ever pass his lips.

His friendships are fast friendships, with far more urbane and sophisticated colleagues, such as Senator MIKE MONRONEY, of Okla-

homa, or THOMAS C. HENNINGS, Jr., of Missouri, whom GORE calls "HENNINS" in his invariable dropping of the final "g" in any word.

How GORE sees the coming investigation is summed up in the grave, old-fashioned, deeply courteous manner in which he speaks, on the stump as well as off:

"If we are to talk about the optimum I should hope that the end result would be to bring about basic remedies for a deplorable and dangerous situation.

"As the population has grown and as the media of communication have become better and more varied, the cost of campaign for the Senate and the House has got beyond the financial capacity of the average man and even the richest would be sorely pressed in the most populous States.

"Therefore, the average candidate for the Senate and House is forced by these conditions to depend upon private campaign contributions. Therein lies a threat to representative government and every Member of the Senate is to one degree or another a part of the electoral process.

"If the American people knew the facts and the conditions surrounding public men there would be a sympathetic attitude toward remedial legislation.

"Many a candidate, including this one, has rationalized campaign contributions on the theory that they were offered merely to assist a good Senator—but it doesn't necessarily follow that the contributor feels the same way.

"The trouble reaches into political parties as such, too, for a platform may be trimmed to attract contributions. Most Senators have nothing to do with the campaign funds raised for them by party finance committees, and they never are sure whether strings are attached.

"And contributions to committees are more coldly calculated than contributions to an individual candidate. It may be argued that a personal contribution is simply an expression of fondness for a candidate; but nobody contributes to a campaign committee for love of that committee."

Failing the attainment of the optimum, GORE hopes simply to dry up clandestine money by disclosures concurrent with the campaign and to get public feeling behind legislation to strengthen laws dealing with contributions, lobbying, and corrupt political practices in general.

For all this he has no firm proposals as yet. "I am goin' into it," he says, "to try to find out what ought to be done and how to do it."

He has had no experience of any kind as a Senate investigator in the common and general understanding of that term. And, a rather grayish sort of man without theatrical quality, he looks a bit hesitantly upon what lies ahead.

"I dunno," he says, "whether I know how to run one of these things or not. But, I'll tell you one thing: Every witness is goin' to have his proper protection. We're not goin' to run any television theater around here."

With this, a small, neat, contained man looking covertly at an old-fashioned gold pocket watch that shows it to be 5 o'clock in the afternoon, reaches into the bottom drawer of his desk, and asks: "Have some?"

He draws forth a box of chocolates, pops one in his mouth, and announces softly: "Pretty good, you know, when you are a little tired."

POLICE COMMISSIONER STEPHEN P. KENNEDY, OF NEW YORK CITY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in yesterday's magazine section of the New York Times, there is an article concerning the outstanding work which is being done by Commissioner Stephen P.

Kennedy, of the New York City Police Department. It is the story of a man of great character, energy, and ability, whose broad shoulders carry responsibility for the enforcement of law in America's greatest metropolis. His competence, zeal, integrity, and devotion to the cause of rectitude in protecting both the public interest and the rights of the individual have won for him a deserved acclaim in an area where such commendation must be well-earned to be given.

Members of the Foreign Relations Committee were highly impressed with Commissioner Kennedy when hearings were held in New York City in 1954 on the International Opium Protocol for limiting the production and distribution of opium and derivative drugs such as heroin and morphine. At that time Mr. Kennedy, who was then chief inspector of the New York Police Department, gave testimony concerning the yeoman work which the narcotics squad of his department was performing in the investigation and detection of the drug traffic. Considering the numerous other duties which his office entailed, he revealed a surprising grasp and understanding of this difficult problem, a problem which the New York City authorities were meeting with much success. Mr. Kennedy was most cooperative and helpful in furnishing the committee with data which it needed to ascertain the importance of giving its approval to the narcotics treaty.

The good people of the city of New York are fortunate, indeed, in having Mr. Kennedy as their chief law enforcement officer. It is a privilege for me to bring his fine work to the attention of the Senate. I should like at this time, Mr. President, to introduce into the RECORD the article by Mr. Murray Schumach, published in Sunday's New York Times, entitled "Tough Boss of 23,000 Police," which attests the faith, the strength, and the humanity of Police Commissioner Kennedy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOUGH BOSS OF 23,000 POLICE

(By Murray Schumach)

Toward the end of 1951, Deputy Inspector Stephen Patrick Kennedy, though a vigorous 45 years of age and a muscular 200 pounds, seemed near the premature end of a very promising career in the New York City Police Department. He had been cut adrift from the challenging command of the riverfront squad to gather barnacles on an unspoiled record in the backwaters of civilian defense duties. It was widely believed in the department that his intransigence on matters of conscience had offended some superiors. Two years later, he still had not learned to be diplomatic about infractions by policemen. He was embedded in what a top police official derided as "some damned thing, some coordinating council, a pure boondoggle."

Today, the same hard-jawed Mr. Kennedy with the furry voice, iron-gray hair and green-gray eyes chain-smokes and gulps black coffee behind a three-telephone desk on the second floor of police headquarters. The only decoration on the dark paneled wall facing him is a framed certificate from Mayor Wagner, reading: "To all to whom these presents shall come—Greetings. Know ye, that reposing special trust and confidence in the

integrity, diligence, and discretion of Stephen P. Kennedy, I have appointed him police commissioner."

There are sagacious prowlers of the echoing corridors of police headquarters who say Mayor Wagner has secured this vital department against corruption by assigning a slums-born, college-educated professional policeman to rule the 22,918 protectors of some 8 million persons and more than \$20 billion in property along the city's 6,033 miles of streets and 578 miles of waterfront. Others, equally knowledgeable of the fates of the 24 men who have departed from the same assignment since the post was established in 1901, say this walking book of rules will undermine the mayor's authority and destroy police morale by breeding nests of informers. One man's municipal FBI is another man's OGPU.

The commissioner's critics, in support of their contention that he is undermining morale, point to the recent examination for applicants for the force. The department had hoped that 20,000 would show up for the tests for the 5,000 additional police the commissioner has requested of the city. Less than 10,000 took the test. This, asserts the anti-Kennedy faction of the department, is the result of inhuman discipline and unrelied tension.

"Any man who comes on the force," replies Commissioner Kennedy, "must understand you never have a personal life entirely and that you have to learn to endure constant tension and discipline and not crack."

The commissioner also cites performance figures. Felonies declined 16.5 percent in 1955, during which he was either commissioner himself or the right hand of Commissioner Francis W. H. Adams. Mr. Adams says that "a lot of the credit I got belongs to Steve Kennedy." Mr. Kennedy was subject to strong abuse when he instituted patrol by unmarked police cars to curb reckless driving. Here, too, his answer has been statistical. In the first 40 days of this year auto deaths in the city were off 20 percent against the same period last year.

Says former Commissioner Adams of the successor he rescued from conscientious obscurity: "Steve Kennedy, if he hadn't been a policeman, would have been a priest or maybe a doctor—something with a principle. His public zeal is like a flame."

Assemblyman Anthony P. Savarese, Jr., disents strongly. He contends that Commissioner Kennedy, by refusing to turn over wiretapping data to his legislative committee, "verges on tyranny."

What are the principles that have projected Commissioner Kennedy into stormy prominence, including defiance of Mayor Wagner? How and why is he trying to change a department that set the pattern for American cities by copying the English design of Sir Robert Peel? Why is he held suspect by politicians and hated by many police officers? Is he a crusader, a fanatic, or just an inevitable type in the evolution of police work from brawn to brain? What changes occur in the personality of this music-fond extevedore when he drops the frigid discipline of duty?

Recently, when a supporter suggested that his official life might be prolonged by imbibing, occasionally and moderately, the mild brew of departmental diplomacy, Commissioner Kennedy retorted with an effective summary of a code he has distilled from 27 years on the force and some 9 years of nocturnal study for high school and college diplomas and a law degree.

"A police commissioner," he explained slowly, "must not only meet the practical problems from day to day; he must be a strong moral force. He must not bow to expediency or to political considerations."

His unshakable faith in his ability to discern right from wrong made him risk his job twice when he was filling out a term before his reappointment to a 5-year term

on February 20. Despite a directive from the mayor, he refused to allow a television company to have access to the departmental files. And when the legislative committee on wire-tapping angrily noted he was the only official in the State to withhold information, he replied:

"I have stood alone on issues before. I believe the position I took was the right one."

From this devotion to the cause of rectitude—his severer critics find it vaguely platitudinous—the commissioner has evolved two corollary gospels. Members of a free society, he warned his ranking subordinates one day, exercise "rights and privileges sanctioned by law" that must ever be defended by the police as sworn duty. Furthermore, he is not reluctant to add, with an almost esthetic appreciation of the symmetry of English common law, the policeman's genial lot must be to succor "the equilibrium between the rights of the individual and those of the community."

The policeman must put behind his gun and shield the tireless fidelity of the St. Bernard dog and the eager virtue of the Boy Scout, a combination many veteran police officers consider beyond the temptation-riddled life of the average policeman or detective. The commissioner, aware of this criticism, says: "The policeman's gun is his cross, and he carries it always."

To make his policemen fit the city's crime, he is determined to wipe out what he calls the coterie concept, a task perhaps unprecedented outside television serials and much more sensational than the generally over-publicized shakeups of inspectors that accompany the appointment of new commissioners.

The coterie concept, is as ingrained in the department as the policeman's memorandum book, in which he must enter all duty calls, and the station house blotter. In each of the city's 81 precincts—and in special squads—the men often develop strong friendships from sharing common problems and dangers. Generally, this esprit is a public benefaction. But often it imposes a code that requires policemen to remain silent when precinct associates succumb to what Commissioner Kennedy calls moral hazards.

To banish this tradition, Commissioner Kennedy's most drastic step has been to transfer more than 450 sergeants, ignoring the protest of their 1,500-man association that has hitherto intimidated many commissioners. Though the commissioner says transfer is no penalty, a close associate explains that he wants to smash a system whereby sergeants can be collectors or coordinators of bribes and protectors of the delinquent.

"There must be no special friendship that transcends the canon of ethics in the department," the commissioner says. Consistent with this—and this is conceded even by his bitterest enemies—he does no favors for politicians, yields to no pressure groups. Finally, he is funneling younger men into the detective division and the higher echelons as quickly as possible on the theory that younger men are less likely to have been contaminated by cynical elders.

To raise departmental standards while continuing to drive down crime, the commissioner probably works longer hours than any other person in the city administration with the possible exception of the mayor. His is a 6-day week, sometimes 7, during which he may put in from 9 to 17 hours daily. By 7 a. m., he has telephoned the communications bureau at headquarters for a rundown of the night's major activities. With the radio blaring news bulletins—he continually swings the dial for fresh broadcasts to his wife's amusement or dismay—he makes phone calls on police matters and is at his desk by 9:30, having leafed through morning

papers in the car. Often he makes surprise stops at precincts on the way in.

On one of these trips, at sunrise on election day, he failed to see four detective commanders where they should have been. One of the officers was demoted, the others were transferred.

After studying reports that range from a typewritten summary of the day's crime to a detailed examination of the crime situation of a precinct sector or entire precinct, he begins a series of conferences with Chief Inspector Thomas A. Nielson, commander of uniformed men. First Deputy Commissioner James R. Kennedy (no relative), Chief of Detectives James B. Leggett, and Deputy Commissioner Walter Arm, in charge of community relations.

The men sit in armchairs near his desk. He speaks softly, quickly. His language is either slangy cop talk or almost academically polysyllabic as his pointed questions run the gamut from the behavior of a particular police officer to the city's "crime incidence." His orders are blunt, but during one recent huddle he reversed himself twice when subordinates disagreed.

At least once, sometimes twice, a week he listens to complaints or requests from policemen. One may want the regular hours of a traffic assignment so he can go to college at night; another, a chance at the detective division; a third, a transfer to a precinct near his home because his wife is ill. He allots about 5 minutes to each man, and usually sees about a dozen per session.

As the policeman enters the Commissioner rises, shakes hands, sits down, waves the patrolman to a nearby chair, and asks, "What's on your mind?" While the policeman talks Kennedy rifles through the man's record, looking for commendations or criticisms. He looks up quickly to ask questions or to study the man's face. If the man falters, he neither interrupts nor helps.

Throughout the day the Commissioner has to make hurried trips. They may be for a traffic conference at city hall; to make a speech at a luncheon of the board of trade; to testify before a grand jury; to present checks to charities on behalf of police groups. Between and during these chores he keeps in touch with headquarters. Lunch is frequently at the Automat or a cafeteria. "He feels more at home there," says an acquaintance.

The afternoon brings more conferences: the police surgeon, the deputy mayor. More question-and-answer sessions with ranking officers. He rarely rolls on crimes—that is, visits the scene. Though he knows the value of this sort of publicity, he avoids it. He prefers to let each subordinate work out such problems without interference. However, after each important police job, he checks carefully on the performance to learn which men distinguished themselves or were inadequate. This information he stores away for reference in connection with promotion—or demotion.

The commissioner says he tries to leave the office by 6:30. But quite often a call from his wife after 7 is required to drag him home to dinner. This, however, does not necessarily end his working day. After dinner, he may decide to spend a few hours checking precincts.

Many officers call this an example of his snooping and spying tactics. "The trouble with a big organization," Kennedy says, by way of reply, "is that there isn't much chance for face-to-face leadership." Be that as it may, these precinct checks have not increased his unimpressive popularity rating in the department. Several days ago, when asked if he had ever felt sorry for a man he had arrested or punished, he replied: "No. A police officer must have the objectivity in his work that precludes any personal feeling, no matter how distasteful the duty."

Away from work, the police commissioner is an unpretentious man, living modestly—

well below the means of his \$25,000 salary—and trying to catch up with cultural pleasures he had to forego as he worked and studied his way up through the ranks.

Very few of his colleagues would recognize in him the grandfatherly type who enjoys amusing colloquies with a boy who lives on the ground floor of the two-family, semi-detached home the Kennedys own in Bayside, Queens. One night, before bedtime, the boy ran upstairs and rapped on the door. Pinned to his pajamas, as he faced the husky police commissioner, was a badge.

"Mister Kennedy," he said with characteristic directness, "I'm a commissioner, too."

Commissioner Kennedy studied the shield, nodded, and began discussing police problems.

The boy interrupted brusquely: "You're the upstairs commissioner and I'm the downstairs commissioner."

Kennedy—whose son attends St. John's University, where the commissioner obtained his law degree, though he never practiced law—is friendly with adult neighbors as well as children. In the summer, while he mows his postage-stamp front lawn and struggles with his hedge and rose bushes, he preserves his warm relationship with the people he has known since he moved into the house in 1932.

"I'm a lousy gardener," he confesses. "But I like to fool around with the roses because it relaxes me." He also paints his own apartment for the same reason.

Theater and opera are probably the only major departures from the habits he formed during boyhood and youth in the Greenpoint section of Brooklyn, where he was born on October 27, 1906. He still looks back with nostalgia on the cold-water flats and the zestful neighborliness of those days. Particularly, he remembers how, when his mother had to be away for an evening, he would eat with the family of his future wife—they were Jewish. Just as often Hortense Goldberger would be fed by the Kennedys.

"I don't think," the commissioner remarked several days ago, "that people have as much fun in neighborhoods as we used to."

As for his two newly acquired diversions, theater and opera, the Commissioner and his wife particularly enjoy the latter. "We had to miss these things when I was working and going to school nights. Now we're trying to catch up," he says. But not even this strong musical enthusiasm can entirely subdue the instincts of the policeman. Thus, Tosca was, for Commissioner Kennedy, not merely the joy of hearing Tebaldi but also a study of police methods.

"Here's this Scarpia," he later told an acquaintance. "He's having his men torture the brains out of the poor guy and he's in the next room trying to have an affair with the fellow's girl." Clearly, he indicated, a violation of police rules.

One of the simple pleasures of Greenpoint for Hortense and Steve was to browse through the public library. Later, working as a stevedore, clerk, and secretary, he continued to pore over books. "You can't learn everything from experience," he says, "and sometimes it's much less painful to learn from a book."

His bookishness helped his police career, but hurt his popularity. "In those days," he recalls, "if you liked to read, they used to say: 'He's too much in the book department.' Now people realize books can help in police work."

This ability to absorb books helped Mr. Kennedy to rise by competitive examination from patrolman in 1929 to captain in 1945. One phase of his studies—at the FBI school in Washington—made a deep impression on him and, in turn, on many of those who judge him. He thinks highly of the FBI. A large segment of the city's police force thinks this organization greatly overrated.

The resultant clash of what he calls "philosophies of police work" may have been partly responsible for his transfer into civilian defense, from which he was elevated to chief inspector by Commissioner Adams in February 1954.

One evening, recently, as he reminisced about his career, he was asked if he had ever been offered a bribe.

"Nobody ever offered me a bribe. If a man is acute he can watch the danger signals and stop it beforehand."

Had he ever, as a boy, swiped anything—say, a potatoe from a stand to be baked in a vacant lot?

"Swipe!" he exclaimed. "I'd get killed. My father'd swat me so hard I'd see stars for 48 days."

Like father, like son. And any policeman the commissioner catches in dishonesty will be swatted unforgettably with a book Commissioner Kennedy places second only to the Bible—The Rules and Regulations of the Police Department of the City of New York.

CONGRATULATIONS TO POPE PIUS XII

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I take this opportunity belatedly to offer my congratulations to Pope Pius XII on the anniversary of his 80th birthday. March 2, 1956, was not only the anniversary of the Pope's birthday, but was also the 17th anniversary of his ascension to the papacy.

Mr. President, no historian of Arizona could help taking note of the tremendous part the Catholic Church has played in the settlement of my native State. In 1539 Father Marcos de Niza brought the cross into what is now Arizona, and in 1687, Father Kino introduced the practice of irrigation on the then wastelands of Arizona. He brought the first cattle and the first horses into what is now the United States, and he established the chain of missions which stretches across the desert of Arizona to California.

I did not want to let pass this opportunity to pay my respects to Pope Pius XII, leader of the Catholic Church who has been throughout his life a bright light of peace in a world which has often been shrouded in darkness.

Mr. President, I desire now to make a unanimous-consent request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

"GIVEAWAY" CHARGES AGAINST SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR McKAY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks which I had prepared, and which I intended to deliver on the floor of the Senate pertaining to "giveaway" charges against Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. I have been prevented from delivering them on the floor of the Senate by the lengthy debate on the farm bill.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On January 31, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] inserted in the RECORD a telegram addressed to the President

of the United States and signed by Richard Case, Robert Bagby, A. B. Hatch, and Harry Whitford.

I do not know these individuals. I have never heard of them before I read their names in the RECORD. But it was apparent that they were making outrageous charges against a member of the present administration, one of our most distinguished public servants, Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay.

I determined that for the benefit of those who might be unwittingly misled as to the true facts, Secretary McKay would be afforded a full opportunity to set forth his reply in the RECORD.

Secretary McKay has now provided me with a copy of a letter which he has sent in reply to the telegram read here on January 29.

This letter is as follows:

FEBRUARY 6, 1956.

Mr. RICHARD CASE,
Director, New York Conservation
Council and Chairman, State
Waterfowl Committee,
Kirkville, N. Y.

DEAR MR. CASE: A telegram to the President which you signed and presumably joined in composing has been called to my attention following its insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on January 31. I understand that a copy of the same telegram was also placed in the RECORD on January 19.

It is with considerable interest and surprise that I have read the unfounded allegations in the message concerning my administration of the affairs of the Department of the Interior.

Your telegram states that I have made persistent efforts to foster the exploitation and destruction of our national parks, forests, and wildlife refuges by commercial interests and by the Armed Forces of the United States.

The solitary piece of evidence that you offer to support this reckless charge is this statement:

"Moreover, the latest of these acts by the custodian of our public lands, whom you appointed, namely, the leasing of the wildlife refuges to oil and gas interests, specifically violates Mineral Leasing Act, Public Law 585, section 10, of the United States Congress, which states clearly that these lands can be leased for other purposes only in time of national emergency and then only by Presidential order."

I find it difficult to believe that you and your three associates in conservation work have been so completely misled by untruthful, politically inspired propaganda that you seem to have abandoned altogether the American concept of fair play. That you have been misled is the most charitable explanation I can find for your charge which is simply not true. I assume, of course, that you did not know it was untrue at the time that you signed your name to the telegram in which the statement is made. It is, nevertheless, amazing to me that an individual who purports to speak on behalf of 40 million citizens of the United States would make the gravest possible charge against the personal integrity of a public official without at least checking the facts.

For your present information, Public Law 585, 83d Congress, section 10 (6), reads as follows:

"(b) Operations on lands belonging to the United States: The Commission is authorized, to the extent it deems necessary to effectuate the provisions of this act, to issue leases or permits for prospecting for, exploration for, mining, or removal of deposits of fissionable source materials (or for any or all of these purposes) in lands belonging to the United States: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provisions of law, such leases or permits may be issued for lands administered for national park, monument, and wildlife purposes only when the President, by Executive order, finds and declares that such action is necessary in the interest of national defense."

Need I point out to you, Mr. Case, that the reference here is specifically to leasing of the lands for exploration for, mining, or removal of deposits of, fissionable source materials?

Need I add, since you so declare in your telegram, that the leasing which you question was for the purpose of oil and gas development?

Because you appear to be misinformed about this matter, permit me to cite for you the facts and the law concerning oil and gas leasing on public lands in fish and wildlife reserves.

1. Lands within fish and wildlife reserves were subject to oil and gas leasing since the passage of the original Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437). The pertinent part of section 1 of that act reads as follows:

"That deposits of * * * oil, * * * or gas, and lands containing such deposits owned by the United States, including those in national forests, but excluding lands acquired under the act known as the Appalachian Forest Act, approved March 1, 1911 (36 Statutes, p. 961) and those in national parks, and in lands withdrawn or reserved for military or naval uses or purposes, except as hereinafter provided, shall be subject to disposition in the form and manner provided by this act to citizens of the United States, or to any association of such persons, or to any corporation organized under the laws of the United States, or of any State or Territory thereof * * *."

It will be noted from the above that the basic law itself eliminates lands owned by the United States which are not subject to oil and gas leasing, and specifically mentions such lands as those described in the Appalachian Forest Act; those in national parks, and lands withdrawn or reserved for military or naval uses or purposes. It is clear from the above, that all other lands owned by the United States are subject to mineral leasing, including lands within fish and wildlife reserves.

The act of August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 950), which amended section 1 of the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, again excluded from the operation of the Mineral Leasing Act "lands acquired under the act known as the Appalachian Forest Act, approved March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), and those in incorporated cities, towns, and villages and in national forests and monuments, those acquired under other acts subsequent to February 25, 1920, and lands within the naval-petroleum and oil-shale reserves." Here again, the particular lands which are not subject to oil and gas leasing are specifically stated in the law. Fish and wildlife reserves are not excepted from the operation of the law. In fact, many prospecting permits, and leases within fish and wildlife reserves have been issued on the public domain since the passage of the basic law of February 25, 1920.

On August 31, 1953, action on most pending oil and gas applications within wildlife refuges was suspended in order that a study might be made with a view of revising the existing regulations to afford greater protection to the fish and wildlife reserves and at the same time offer an opportunity for the development of the mineral resources in these reserves under sound conservation principles. After more than 2 years of such study I approved the amended regulations now embodied in Circular No. 1945, which gives full protection to fish and wildlife areas by special stipulations embodied in each lease for the protection of such reserves.

2. Since the Mineral Leasing Act provides for issuance of the right to prospect for oil and gas on Fish and Wildlife reserved land, it is unreasonable to hold that the Department should indefinitely suspend the issuance of oil and gas leases in such lands. It

was therefore intended, when the suspension order was issued, that it would be removed when revised regulations are approved, which would give added protection to Fish and Wildlife Reserves. That such added protection is embodied in the new regulations is apparent from its provisions.

(a) These regulations eliminate from the operation of the leasing act Fish and Wildlife Reserves in Alaska on certain of the Aleutian Islands; in the Okefenokee Reserve in Georgia; in the Patuxent Reserve in Maryland; in the National Bison Range and Red Rock Lakes in Montana; in Fort Niobrara Reserve in Nebraska; in the Sullys Hill Reservation in North Dakota; in the Aransas and Santa Ana Reserves in Texas, and in the National Elk Reserve in Wyoming. In the above Fish and Wildlife Reserves no leases will be issued.

(b) These new regulations provide further protection to other reserves listed in appendix B of the regulations by requiring that no leases will be issued in this category unless a complete and detailed program for the area is submitted for approval of the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service in order to insure full protection of the particular values for which the reserve was established. These areas were designated by the Fish and Wildlife Service as wilderness, recreational, water development, or marsh, with respect to which oil and gas development without rigid control and under specific conditions might seriously impair or destroy the usefulness of the lands for wildlife conservation purposes.

In every instance where a lease is issued in conformance with these regulations, such lease will contain in addition to the other requirements the following special stipulations:

1. Geological and geophysical prospecting conducted on the leased premises shall be of a type and at a time satisfactory to the Fish and Wildlife Service.

2. No drilling operations shall be conducted under the lease until such lease has been committed to an approved unit plan. However, the Secretary may, in his discretion, permit or require drilling if he determines that a unit plan including the leased area cannot be secured and that drilling is necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

(a) A unit agreement which includes lands administered for wildlife conservation shall contain a provision that no drilling operations may be conducted on the unitized portion of the Government-leased lands administered for wildlife conservation without the consent and approval of the Fish and Wildlife Service as to the time, place, and nature of such operations.

(b) In every instance, a plan of development which includes lands administered for wildlife conservation shall not be approved without the concurrence of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

(c) Lessees shall observe and comply with all State and Federal laws and regulations relating to wildlife and shall take such action as is necessary to assure observance and compliance with these laws and regulations by lessees, employees, and agents.

Moreover, action has been taken on December 22, 1955, by an order of the Acting Director of the Bureau of Land Management, which agency processes these leases, to suspend action on oil and gas applications within fish and wildlife refuges included in reserves not mentioned in appendixes A or B of the recent regulations in order to give the Fish and Wildlife Service a further opportunity to add other reserves to these lists, either in appendix A, which would prohibit leasing, or in appendix B, which would permit leasing only after the Fish and Wildlife Service approves a plan of operation to give complete protection to the wildlife in such reserves.

3. The objection of the Wildlife Management Institute of Washington to the issu-

ance of leases to be operated by the Frankfort Oil Co. in the Lacassine Water Power Reserve, Cameron Parish, La., on what it terms as "ridiculously low" royalty rates, and on a noncompetitive basis, must be based on both ignorance of the law and of the facts.

The royalty rates for noncompetitive leases is established by law and the Secretary of the Interior is without authority to increase the legal rate so established.

Section 5 of the act of August 8, 1946, under the provisions of which such leases issued, provides "such leases shall be conditioned upon the payment by the lessee of a royalty of 12½ percent in amount or value of the production removed or sold from the lease."

The same section provides that "when the lands to be leased are not within any known geologic structure of a producing oil or gas field, the person first making application for the lease who is qualified to hold a lease under this act shall be entitled to a lease of such lands without competitive bidding."

The leases issued under the new regulations in which the Frankfort Oil Co. is the operator embrace acquired lands, as distinguished from the public domain. The act of August 7, 1947 (61 Stat. 913), known as the Acquired Land Leasing Act, provides that acquired lands "may be leased by the Secretary under the same conditions as contained in the leasing provisions of the Mineral Leasing Laws, subject to the provisions hereof." Consequently the provisions of the act of August 8, 1946, cited above, as to royalty and issuing leases noncompetitively apply. The Geological Survey reported the lands embraced in the so-called Frankfort Oil Co. leases as not being on a structure of a known oil or gas field. The Frankfort Oil Co. submitted a plan of operation prior to the issuance of the leases which was approved by the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service. It is apparent, therefore, that I was bound by the law and could not issue these leases competitively, nor could I prescribe a royalty other than that prescribed in the law, to wit, 12½ percent.

4. As a matter of fact, the plan of operations submitted by the Frankfort Oil Co. and approved by the Fish and Wildlife Service when put in operation will enhance the value of the Lacassine Waterfowl Refuge and not destroy the wildlife or the lands in the reserve. While the plan is a lengthy one and would not be practical to quote in full, let me call your attention to some of its basic provisions. Among the adequate provisions made to preserve the ecological conditions and to improve the refuge are:

(a) No pollution or undesirable disturbance of the condition of impounded waters will result from the operations of the company.

(b) There will be no disturbance in the use by ducks and geese on the area in question if they choose to use the area.

(c) The operating program of the company is specifically designed to improve the attractiveness of the area in question as a resting place and feeding ground for wildlife, and particularly for migratory waterfowl, which up to the present have avoided the area in question, preferring the northern section of the refuge.

The whole plan is designed so that the company assume the responsibility for undertaking a mineral-development program which will satisfy the Department that the highest standards are met in the development and conservation of mineral and wildlife resources. In every condition of the lease and of the plan of operation the primary aim has been to permit operations only under such conservation measures as will insure the adequate utilization of the lands for the primary purposes for which they have been acquired or are being administered. No one who knows the facts could make the charge of lack of conservation of wildlife areas in the issuance of such oil and gas

leases. Moreover, these amended regulations will insure that all future leases likewise will contain conditions which will protect in full measure wildlife areas, and where such protection cannot be assured in certain areas, no leases will issue.

It might be of interest to note that the greater part—60 percent—of the reserve is under active mineral development by nine companies. The mineral-development activities in the refuge now include nine producing wells all outside of the area leased. This is possible because when the United States purchased these lands the oil and gas rights were reserved by the original owners. Consequently, the United States has no jurisdiction over drilling in this area. It must be assumed that since drilling operations are now being conducted in the northern part of the refuge that sooner or later wells will be drilled near the southern part of the refuge adjoining the 40 percent of the area now covered by the Frankfort leases and may cause drainage of oil and gas from the area controlled by the Fish and Wildlife Service. Consequently, it was advantageous to the United States and to the preservation of the refuge area to issue leases and control operations thereunder, under a plan approved by the Fish and Wildlife Service which would give added protection to the area, than wait until drainage of oil or gas occurs when the United States would be compelled, in order to protect its oil and gas rights, to issue leases without the protection it now has.

If I appear, Mr. Case, to write you in some detail, I trust you will understand that I want to make unquestionably clear the facts and the law about which you have been so seriously misinformed.

As I have observed your erroneous reference to leasing of wildlife refuges as contrary to law, is the only piece of evidence of any sort that you offer to support the sweeping charges that you make in your telegram. I am forced to conclude that you have no other evidence to back up your unfounded generalizations. This is understandable, I might point out, since none exists.

At such a time as you might wish to learn something of my firm policy of carrying out vigorously my assigned responsibilities for the protection and development of our national parks, forests, and wildlife refuges, I am sure you cannot fail to be impressed by the facts of record.

I am proud of the record of accomplishments which have advanced the cause of conservation since this administration took office. Files of the Department contain numerous letters of commendation from conservationists and leaders of their national organizations who have taken the time to study this record objectively. I shall cite a few instances from this record of which you do not seem to be aware.

I strongly endorsed and the Department worked for the passage of Public Law 167 which the President has described as "one of the most important conservation measures affecting public lands that has been enacted in many years." This law ended abuses of the mining laws under which claims could be filed, not for bona fide mining purposes but for the purpose of obtaining claims or title to valuable timber, summer-home sites, or grazing land and water. Public Law 167 affords infinitely greater protection to timber resources in our national forests than has ever before been known.

Under this administration the National Park Service has embarked on the most comprehensive program of protection, improvement, and development in its history. We call this Mission 66, because it is a 10-year program designed to provide the National Park Service with all it needs to protect the parks and to provide for 80 million visitors by 1966. The program has been submitted to the Congress with the strong support of President Eisenhower.

The Park Service is operating in the current fiscal year with a budget 40 percent

higher than it had when I took office. The integrity of the system has been protected by my action in rejecting numerous proposals which would have intruded upon the natural beauty of park areas.

I have announced my unalterable opposition to the proposed transfer of lands of the Wichita National Wildlife Refuge to the Department of the Army. Sincere conservationists have been fit to praise generously and on frequent occasion my efforts to preserve intact the boundaries of the Wichita Refuge.

You may recall a smear attack which was made on me a few months ago because the Department granted a temporary permit to the Navy for use of 49 acres in the Cape Hatteras National Recreational Area which covers a total of 28,500 acres. The permit was granted after protracted negotiations during which the Navy certified that use of the land was essential to the national security. Yet this was labeled a "McKay giveaway." I was interested to note that Mr. Fred M. Packard, executive secretary of the National Parks Association, has now reported in the current issue of National Parks magazine that he is convinced the Navy facility at Cape Hatteras is warranted.

I greatly regret that at least some of the facts that I have set forth were not in your possession at the time that you signed your recent telegram attacking me. I have the good faith to believe that if you had known these facts you would not have been moved to make statements and allegations that were unfortunately not only unsubstantiated but at variance with the truth.

Sincerely yours,

Secretary of the Interior.

I point out that Secretary McKay has been very kind and generous and charitable with the gentlemen who have directed a reckless and irresponsible attack against him.

As set forth in his letter, the facts speak for themselves.

There is nothing new about oil and gas leasing on certain wildlife refuges.

It has been authorized by law since 1920.

The very refuge about which so much has been said lately, the Lacassine Refuge in Louisiana, had nine producing wells on it before this administration came into office. These wells are on land where the mineral rights were retained by the owners at the time the land was incorporated in the refuge.

Except for the making of twisted political charges by enemies of Secretary McKay and the administration, I fail to see the difference between drilling for oil on land where the mineral rights are privately held and the drilling on land where the rights are held by the Government. Certainly there is no difference as far as the wildlife is concerned.

But the smear artists do not talk of the wells already operating in the refuge. Rather, they choose to hold up their hands in horror over some purported misdeed of the Secretary. They want to convey the impression that he has let down the bars to a hitherto untouched wilderness area which has never heard the voices of men or the sound of machines before. Quite the contrary is true as any reasonable examination of the facts will show.

The first Interior Department regulation under which leases were issued was signed in 1947 by a Secretary in the previous administration.

Because he found the 1947 regulations inadequate, Secretary McKay suspended them and ordered new ones drafted which would afford greater protection of the wildlife values in the refuges.

It was the announcement that these new regulations had been signed which touched off the present storm of abuse directed at the Secretary. His political opponents leaped at the opportunity to twist and distort his action in an effort to mislead many sincere conservationists.

In his reply to the attack made on him in the telegram to the President, Secretary McKay has very patiently explained the true facts regarding his administration of the affairs of the Interior Department, with particular reference to oil and gas leasing in wildlife refuges.

The gentlemen who signed the telegram charge that Secretary McKay has made persistent efforts to foster the exploitation and destruction of our national parks, forest, and wildlife refuges.

But, as Secretary McKay makes clear, they offer only one solitary piece of evidence to support this sweeping charge. And, Mr. President, that particular piece of evidence turns out to be completely baseless.

I have read with care Secretary McKay's detailed statement of the law and the facts about the policies of his Department regarding the issuance of oil and gas leases on wildlife. I suggest my colleagues do the same. The Secretary's letter makes crystal clear that he is carrying out in every respect the intent of Congress when it passed the laws which govern these matters.

Quite recently newspapers all over this country reprinted an editorial of the Laredo Times of Texas which described Secretary McKay as one of our greatest Secretaries of the Interior. Mr. President, I want to join today in endorsing that statement. Douglas McKay is doing an outstanding job and he deserves the heartfelt thanks of all Americans who are concerned with the wise conservation and sound development of our country's natural resources.

Under ordinary circumstances, it would therefore be disturbing to find individuals, describing themselves as Republicans, asking that the President remove this official from office.

In this case, however, it is not disturbing at all since the individuals in question are a mighty peculiar breed of Republicans if, indeed, they be Republicans at all. Certainly, their unwarranted charges in this instance have a distinct ring of the official New Deal campaign line.

And they have cast a grave shadow over every sportsman and sincere conservationist in the country by their resort to crude political methods in dealing with a subject which is not political in any sense and should be kept beyond the realm of partisan politics for the greatest good of all.

Here is the arrogant threat which they have served on the President of the United States:

"We don't like McKay. Because we don't like him, you must fire him. If you don't do our bidding, we will bring about the defeat of the Republican Party, regardless of candidate, in the next election."

These four individuals, who call themselves Republicans, threaten single-handedly to bring about the defeat of the Republican Party at the next election unless the President of the United States immediately does as they direct.

Who are these political wizards? I do not know them. Perhaps the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, who has suddenly become solicitous of the welfare of the Republican Party, knows them. He introduced their telegram into the Record. He has been kind enough to warn us Republicans of the tremendous vote-manipulating power of these friends of his. I suspect that the Senator from Minnesota has really not changed his viewpoint or the philosophy for which he is well known in this chamber. As far as I know, he still plans to work for the election of a Democrat candidate. I suspect, therefore, he may have had his tongue in his cheek when he joined the authors of this telegram in warning the Republican Party as to what it would have to do, if it wants to win the next election.

The junior Senator from Minnesota has come here on the floor of the Senate bearing gifts but not gifts that we Republicans want to accept. And I don't think we are

going to accept his kind words of political advice now, either.

These Republican friends of the Senator from Minnesota are not pikers. They promise to defeat the Republican Party—regardless of candidate. They don't care whom we run. They don't care, I presume, whom the Democrats run. They don't care about the issues. Their vote is for sale—for the price of firing McKay. It's as simple as that.

I don't know whether the Senator from Minnesota is going to take my advice any more than I am going to take his, but I suggest to him that he introduce his friends to the Democrat National Committee. Imagine how Paul Butler would welcome these men on his staff. He could get rid of Clayton Fritchey and the rest of his expensive propaganda machinery. He could junk the Democratic Digest. If he would simply turn the campaign over to these friends of the Senator from Minnesota, his worries would be over.

If the Senator from Minnesota doubts my word about this, let me read the proof that these friends of his offer the President of the United States to prove their awesome political power. Let me read from the telegram the Senator from Minnesota introduced into the Record:

"If you question our ability to muster votes for conservation, witness the defeat of amendment 7 in New York State last November by a majority of over 2 to 1, despite the efforts of politicians and selfish interests over a period of 30 years. It took us only 6 weeks to do that—we have 36 weeks to organize the 40 million purchasers of hunting and fishing licenses in the United States."

There you have it.

I rise to the defense of the sportsmen and conservationists of this country. They are not going to be led meekly to the polls by a group of disgruntled individuals masquerading as conservationists. I know thousands of sportsmen and conservationists. They are fine people. They are good citizens. Before they cast their votes they want the facts. They want to hear from many others besides a few who are quick to assess blame and loud in demanding redress of an imagined grievance before they have heard the whole story.

Incidents such as this lead me to suggest to my conservationist friends that they bear in mind in the months to come that this is an election year.

We have had ample warnings by now of the lengths to which the foes of the Eisenhower administration are willing to go in their frantic efforts to achieve their ends.

The devotion and the enthusiasm of conservationists for their cause makes them the natural objects of New Deal inflammatory propaganda. Reckless charges calculated to arouse their apprehension over the handling of our natural resources have been made in the past and, I am sure, will continue to be made in the future.

But I am confident that the many sincere conservationists throughout the country will resist all such attempts to use them and the great cause they represent for brazen political purposes.

They are going to get the facts, Mr. President, and they are going to weigh them carefully, and then they are going to vote for a Republican President, just as they did in 1952.

And as they do, I am sure they will be aware of the patient and untiring efforts of Secretary Douglas McKay to carry out the many responsibilities of his office in the face of a vicious and calculated smear campaign based on sly innuendo, misrepresentation and half-truths, or no truth at all.

They will be aware, for example, of the great new program for the development of the national parks, which was prepared under his direction and transmitted to Congress with the full endorsement of the President.

The program, known as Mission 66, will cost approximately \$124 million during the next 10 years. It is designed to equip the parks to handle 80 million visitors by 1966.

One of the first acts of this administration, insofar as our national parks are concerned, was to reverse the 15-year trend of neglect which was touched off by World War II and prolonged by the Korean conflict.

Today, under the administration of Secretary McKay, the national park system is larger, more adequately staffed, and more efficiently administered than it ever has been.

Since this administration entered office in January 1953, more than 130,000 acres have been added to the park system. The Park Service currently is operating on a budget approximately 40 percent higher than when this administration came into office.

Mention of this administration's record in the field of conservation would not be complete without calling attention to the manner in which the integrity of the park system has been protected under Secretary McKay.

For example, the Department rejected efforts to obtain permits to build tramways at Mount Rainier National Park, Rocky Mountain National Park, Crater Lake National Park, and Grand Canyon National Park.

The Department has rejected efforts to modify the newly extended boundaries of Olympic National Park.

The Department has rejected efforts to open Joshua Tree National Monument to mineral prospecting and mining, or to abolish it altogether. Protection of this area was strengthened when 10,000 acres inside the monument boundaries were acquired in exchange for 10,000 acres of federally owned grazing land outside the monument.

Negotiations with the Department of the Navy resulted in withdrawal of a proposal to use a considerable portion of Death Valley National Monument as an aerial gunnery range.

I believe that Mission 66 will prove to be the finest contribution to national parks since the Service was established in 1916.

The Department has also established 8 new wildlife refuges, and 3 more are in the process of being established. During the last fiscal year wildlife refuges received the largest allocation of funds ever made for acquisition, development, and maintenance.

Since this administration took office, nearly 80,000 additional acres have been acquired for wildlife preservation through purchase, lease, or transfer of federally owned lands.

Under this administration, Federal wildlife refuges have been established for the first time in Kansas and Colorado. New lands have been added to the Federal refuge program in Louisiana, North Dakota, Kentucky, Tennessee, South Carolina, Texas, Washington, Florida, Maine, Oregon, Idaho, Michigan, and New York.

In the 6 years preceding this administration, 36 wildlife refuges were abolished. The total Federal wildlife reserves were reduced by 408,527 acres during that period.

These are only a few of the facts of record regarding the work and achievements of Secretary McKay and the Interior Department in protecting our most precious heritage, the natural resources of this country. They are worthy of the attention of all members of the conservation movement and I know that when the facts have been studied, the true story will begin to emerge of how a courageous public servant has struggled to fulfill the responsibilities of his office, too often receiving smear and slander as his only reward.

THE STATUS OF FORCES TREATY— AMERICANS SUBJECT TO FOREIGN LAWS NOT COMPATIBLE WITH UNITED STATES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, an editorial in the Washington Post and

Times Herald of this morning brings to mind a very important treaty, a treaty which vitally affects the welfare of many of our people, especially those in the Armed Forces.

GI TRIED IN FOREIGN COUNTRY

That treaty is the Status of Forces Treaty which provides that a member of our Armed Forces who is charged with a crime in a foreign country must be tried under the laws of that country where the crime is alleged to have been committed.

This treaty has been condemned by many patriotic organizations and thoughtful persons in the United States, including the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Business and Professional Women, and many others.

Under this treaty, if a GI commits a crime in one of the Middle East countries, he may have his hand amputated for stealing a loaf of bread, for example.

THE EDITORIAL

The editorial is entitled "Mr. Bow's Curved Ball." It reads in part as follows:

A dangerous move to undermine the North Atlantic Alliance is underway in the House of Representatives. Under the pretense of protecting the rights of American armed personnel abroad, Representative Bow and a number of his colleagues are pushing a resolution that would direct the President to denounce or revise the Status of Forces Treaty. Success for this venture would leave NATO in a condition of uncertainty that it might not be able to survive.

NATO: THE ATLANTIC TREATY

NATO never was in a position to survive. It was stillborn, because it guaranteed something which all the power of the United States cannot guarantee, that is, the status quo and the integrity of the colonial slavery system throughout the world.

How does it do that? Through our guaranty to go to war when the empire-minded nations of Europe, England, France, the Netherlands, and Belgium are at war. We have no control over how they get into war. How are they going to get into war? As has been amply demonstrated during the life of the treaty, by defending their colonial slavery system.

We broke away from England's colonial slavery system in 1776—the first break in the system. Yet we agree to assist holding other nations under the system.

This treaty is very dangerous to the welfare of the United States and to its citizens in our Armed Forces.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] has asked me to yield to him for

20 or 25 minutes. If there is no objection on the part of the acting majority leader, I am happy to yield to the Senator from Montana for 25 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I do not wish to object, but before the Senator from Montana proceeds I should like to inform the acting majority leader that it is my intention to speak on the farm bill tomorrow. I give notice that I intend to speak on the bill tomorrow.

Mr. THYE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to have the floor tomorrow following the conclusion of the morning business, to make an address on the farm question.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico that he be permitted to yield to the Senator from Montana for 25 minutes? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the Agricultural Act of 1956.

There are involved in any discussion of the farm bill extremely important issues beyond the field of agriculture itself.

The action taken by Congress on this measure will affect the national economy, from small town main streets to major industrial centers. It will establish precedents in the field of resources conservation. It can have a marked effect on our international relationships, and our efforts to establish peace throughout the world.

In our consideration of this measure, therefore, we need to bear in mind, in addition to the serious economic plight of the farmers, the effect that a continued agricultural depression can have on our national economy. We need to examine the sort of resources conservation policy we are establishing. And we need to measure the effect which either surplus dumping, or excessive restriction of our food production, may have on our foreign policy in a hungry world.

Although I shall support a number of amendments, I regard the bill reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry greatly superior to the proposals made to it by the Secretary of Agriculture for the administration. The administration proposals did not provide any real net additions to farm income. Our committee, by restoring 90-percent supports and dual parity, has provided for some additional net to farmers and I congratulate them for it.

ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF THE FARM SITUATION

There is a great deal of evidence that the present deflation of farmers, and the effort to keep farm prices low regardless of consequences in agriculture, is a deliberate and positive part of overall administration economic policy.

Political capital was made in the summer and fall of 1952—although price indexes had been stable then for many months—about inflation and 50-cent dollars. Campaign promises were made that inflation would be stopped and the

purchasing power of the dollar would be stabilized.

In the spring of 1953, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in one of his reports for the now nonexistent Independent Party, warned us that deliberate deflation of agriculture could be expected.

The Senator called our attention to a study that had just been issued by the New York Clearing House Association, composed of the New York banks which were providing key officials for the new administration. The study was entitled "The Federal Reserve Reexamined." This elaborately printed study came to this conclusion:

The major challenge * * * is the problem of resisting those forces tending to debase the value of money and combating them effectively whenever they are in the ascendant.

The study listed as "more important" inflationary factors—factors that had to be fought—Government spending and debt, loan programs, the full employment goal, demands of labor for wage increases in excess of productivity gains and "support of agricultural prices at high parity levels."

This study was a blueprint of the hard-money policy which the administration instituted in its early months. Interest rates were increased both on what the Government borrowed and on the Government lending programs, including housing loans and agricultural credit programs. In March and April 1953, a slide in farm product prices was started. The Commodity Credit Corporation reduced the price on one of its large feed holdings, cottonseed meal, from \$80 per ton to \$57 per ton. This caused the market price of this important feed ingredient to break \$10 per ton in the Memphis, Tenn., market during the week of April 16, 1953. The Commodity Credit Corporation sold more than 700,000 tons of this meal, thereby weakening the prices of other oilmeals and feed. This was the beginning of the deliberately induced slide of farm prices, which has been kept going by reduction of dairy price supports, reduction of the various feed and oilmeal price supports, and, finally, reduction of the supports of basic commodities, which were held to 90 percent of parity through 1954 by the farm law.

The record does not bear out the contentions that the "sliding scale" did not become effective until 1955. The slide started on nonbasic commodities with the cottonseed meal deals of 1953. The low price policy for agriculture has been pursued since early 1953.

The drastic monetary and fiscal policies adopted early in 1953 by the new administration induced a recession, and those policies were moderated within a few months. Making money scarce and dear by interest boosts proved to have such serious effects in the business world that this means of achieving a stable dollar was deemphasized.

Although there have been continuing attacks on labor wage levels, such as Secretary of Agriculture Benson's frequent illusions to "soft wage increases," the administration has found it either unwise or impossible to drive labor's wages down.

The New York bankers' blueprint did not call for any limitations on profiteering or excessive business profits, and no effort to impose such limitations was to be anticipated with businessmen "here in the saddle," as Secretary of the Interior McKay put it. That area of action to maintain the purchasing power of the dollar was not even to be considered.

The result of experience with the administration application of its hard-money policy has been that farmers almost alone have been deflated—and the farmers have been bled absolutely white—to keep the administration pledge of a stable dollar. Small business has suffered as a result of the decline of purchasing power of its customers and the ruthless competition of big business. But in the area of price deflation, the farmers have been made to foot the whole bill not only of dollar stability, but the cost of higher prices and higher profits for the big-business men who are here in the saddle.

A look at the cost-of-living index, maintained by the United States Department of Labor, shows the situation.

The cost of living has gone up eight-tenths of 1 percent between 1952 and 1955. The index stood at 113.5 for the year 1952 and at 114.5 for the year 1955. The only item in the whole index which showed any decline was food. The consumer price of foods was off 3 percent. Housing, rent, medical care, transportation, electricity and gas, solid fuels and fuel oil and household operation had climbed from 1 to 11 percent.

Cost of housing was up 5 percent.
Rent was up 11 percent.
Medical care costs have gone up 8 percent.
Electricity and gas are up 6 percent.
Solid fuels and fuel oil are up 5 percent.
The cost of household operations is up 7 percent.

Whatever stability there has been in the total cost of living index has been achieved by the deduction of other rises from payments for food produced by the farmers.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD a table of the changes between 1952 and 1955 in this index.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Cost of living index

	1952	1955	Percent change
All items.....	113.5	114.5	+0.8
Food.....	114.6	110.9	-3
Housing.....	114.6	120.0	+5
Rent.....	117.9	130.3	+11
Medical care.....	117.2	128.0	+9
Transportation.....	126.2	126.3	+0.08
Electricity and gas.....	104.5	110.7	+6
Solid fuels and fuel oil.....	118.7	125.2	+5
Household operations.....	111.8	119.1	+7

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the New York Times, in an article by Richard Rutter which appeared in the January 26, 1956, issue, challenged a statement in the President's Economic Re-

port, which had just been released, contending that a record business boom had been accomplished without the accompanying specter of inflation.

The Times article continued:

But had it?
Almost daily for the past few months, news articles carried reports of significant price increases. These have occurred mainly in industrial commodities, but some consumer items have been affected.

The article then pointed out that with the single exception of food:

Every other item in the cost-of-living yardstick—apparel, housing, gas and electricity, transportation, services, and the like—has risen substantially.

The Times concluded:

So the apparent stability in the cost of living has been entirely due to a decline in food costs.

The cost to farmers of the consumer savings on food has been a great deal more than the 3 percent finally reflected to the housewife. Before the lower food prices reached the consumers, to offset and absorb the price increases of all other categories of consumer prices, the processors and distributors of food products took advantage of a heavy share of the farmers' losses. Farm prices have dropped from 100 percent of parity in 1952 to 80 percent at the last report. This is a decline of 20 percent in the farm price level to get through just a 3 percent decline in consumer food prices.

On February 28 the Associated Press carried a story to all the newspapers of the Nation announcing that administration economists were sticking to their claim of no inflation in spite of price increases in coal, copper, lumber, fuel oil, tin, rubber, rayon, and many others.

The press agency reported:

Official statistics support Mr. Eisenhower's views (that there has been no inflation). Although almost all family budget items except food rose during 1955, the Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Index climbed only four-tenths of 1 percent for the year.

The story continues:

Food, representing 30 percent of the index, dropped seven-tenths of 1 percent last year and almost 5 percent in the last 4 years. That movement reflects in part the 5-year, 25 percent slump in prices received by farmers. It probably has prevented living costs from moving up past the record set in October 1953.

Mr. President, a careful reading of this article will confirm the familiar fact that the farmers have had to pay the bill, both for the alleged stability of living costs and for swollen profits. I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 28, 1956]

UNITED STATES SPIKES INFLATION TALK AS PRICES RISE SLIGHTLY
(By Sterling F. Green)

Government economists today stuck to their forecasts of no inflation while reporting prices still are edging up generally, with falling food costs obscuring the rise.

The consumer price index for January, issued last week, showed a slight decline for the second successive month. The drop was caused primarily by lower meat and grocery bills.

But price increases have occurred recently in many basic industries—coal, copper, lumber, fuel oil, tin, rubber, and rayon, among others. There is trade talk of possible rises in steel and aluminum.

SEEMING CONFLICT

This might seem to conflict with President Eisenhower's assertion, in the economic message to Congress a month ago, that record income and production levels were achieved in 1955 without the specious aid of price inflation.

Official statistics support Mr. Eisenhower's views. Although almost all family budget items except food rose during 1955, the Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Index climbed only four-tenths of 1 percent of the year.

Food, representing 30 percent of the index, dropped seven-tenths of 1 percent last year and almost 5 percent in the past 4 years.

That movement reflects in part the 5-year, 25 percent slump in prices received by farmers. It probably has prevented living costs from moving up past the record set in October, 1953. In that month the index stood at 115.4 percent of the 1947-4 average; today's index is 114.6.

The wholesale index, watched more closely by businessmen because it covers the materials of production, has risen more rapidly—about 1.5 percent in the past 12 months. Not counting farm products and processed foods, the basic industrial commodities rose more than 4 percent in 1955. Meats skidded 17 percent and processed foods dropped 5 percent.

TREND IS UPWARD

Some high-ranking Government economists report that they expect more of the same during at least the early part of 1956. They make one important exception: Farm prices, they agree, may stabilize but probably will not rise appreciably this year.

"For a time we expect a continuation of what we've been having," said one economist. "The general trend is upward and it still has momentum."

Continued rises are expected in many of the consumer costs which increased last year.

Why, then, do Government economists expect a fair degree of consumer price stability? They give these reasons among others:

Part of the higher cost will be absorbed by the manufacturers because sales competition is getting keener. Corporation profits, which in 1955 were the second highest in history, may be shaved. Retailers may be obliged to trim their margins, though many are already complaining of a profit squeeze.

RISE IN PRODUCTIVITY

Rising productivity—more goods per worker per hour—will offset another portion of the increased labor and materials expense. Investment in plant mechanization and labor-saving machinery has been at record levels, and is continuing.

Auto prices are likely to stay stable. Competition for volume sales remains keen and, as one official observed, "there are just too many cars running around." Housing costs still are rising but the industry is becoming concerned over the possibility of pricing itself out of the market.

In the household-appliance field, officials report, there is little opportunity to mark up price tags. Consumers are well stocked;

they can afford to wait for bargains and react adversely to price boosts.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the deliberate nature of this policy of deflation of agriculture is reflected in every administration statement on the subject.

Secretary Benson has repeatedly contended that the low prices would be the farmers' salvation; that they would increase per capita consumption of foods and cause the farmers to reduce production. The President, in his 1954 message, offered only the reassurance that abrupt declines in farm prices would be avoided. Here in Congress, we have heard leaders praise the "graduality" of the farm deflation as the great virtue of the Eisenhower-Benson farm policy. They have never talked of maintaining or restoring farm prices. They talk only of letting them go on down—gradually.

Secretary of Agriculture Benson in recent months has attempted to turn the wrath of farmers, aroused by the deliberate deflation of their prices and income, against labor by referring to "round after round" of "soft" labor wage increases.

But the Secretary's charges in this area have made little headway, for another administration spokesman, the Commissioner of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor, has publicly stated that manufacturing output per man-hour rose 10 percent from 1953 to 1955. Average hourly wages of production workers in manufacturing rose 6 percent in those years.

What has risen are the profits of the businessmen who, as Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay said in an address to the United States Chamber of Commerce, which was tape recorded, are "here in the saddle."

Corporation profits are up 18 percent before taxes and up 32 percent after taxes.

Dividends paid to stockholders are up 19 percent.

The fact is that in the third quarter last year dividends paid to stockholders passed the total net income of the Nation's farm operators. In the fourth quarter, dividends paid stockholders were at a rate of \$2 billion more per annum than total net farm income.

The only time before in our national history when this situation prevailed was in the period from 1930 through 1932.

It should be unnecessary to have to describe the national economic situation in those years, but apparently some people have forgotten them. Our Nation was in the deepest economic difficulties in its history. Stock market values based on pure speculative fever, in face of declining agricultural income and purchasing power, had collapsed. There was a Farm Holiday Association spreading in the Middle West, just as there is a National Farmers Organization spreading through that area today. We were undergoing the Hoover depression.

I am aware that any effort to warn the administration and the Congress of serious economic consequences of their

policies, subjects one to the risk of being described as a "prophet of gloom and doom." But someone must take that risk. I do not predict a depression. There is still time to make economic adjustments and avoid a great economic catastrophe. But adjustments must be made. The parallels between the twenties and the early thirties are too numerous to be ignored. And unless adjustments are made, including a rebuilding of the income of the farmers, serious consequences to the whole economy are inevitable.

There is immediate need for action both to raise agricultural income and also to halt profiteering by big monopolistic enterprises in this Nation which so thoroughly control basic industries that they are able to raise their prices and maintain their excessive profits in the face of surpluses even greater than those in agriculture.

An investigation by labor economists of Secretary Benson's recent allusions to soft wage increases has yielded a very significant picture of what is going on in our economy.

Mr. Donald Montgomery, director of the Washington office of the United Automobile Workers, summarized these findings in an address to the Pacific Northwest Farm Forum at Spokane, Wash., a few days ago—on February 13. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks and analysis appear at this point in the RECORD. It is an excellent showing that profiteering—not soft wage increases—is boosting prices.

There being no objection, the remarks and analysis were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDUSTRY PROFITEERING IS RAISING FARMERS' COSTS

(By Donald Montgomery, director, Washington office, United Automobile Workers, at Pacific Northwest Farm Forum, Spokane, Wash., February 13, 1956)

I

They are laying workers off at automobile plants, 8,500 in December, more than 28,000 in January.

General Motors says car production will be cut 12 percent this year.

One explanation is—farmers are not buying as many cars as they would like to buy. Falling farm income is responsible.

This is one good and practical reason why organized labor does not like what is happening to farmers, and why they would like to do something about it.

Since the war, wages, profits and dividends have been going up; farm income has been going down. This sharp movement in opposite directions of two major divisions of our economy creates, as we see it, nothing less than a national emergency. Drastic action is called for. The remedy, obviously, is to get the farm economy back into line with the rest of us.

How to do that I can't tell you. That's farmers' business. My assignment here, as I interpret it, is to answer Secretary of Agriculture Benson's charge that labor's wage increases are putting the bite on farmers. As background for that, I ask you first to look at the important postwar trends within our economy.

The last 3 years (1952-55) in this postwar period show some marked differences from the first 5 (1947-52).

Postwar trends in the American economy

	Wages and salaries	Corporation profits		Corporation dividends	Net income of farm operators from farming
		Before taxes	After taxes		
1947.....billion dollars..	125.2	29.5	18.2	6.5	17.2
1952.....do.....	190.5	35.9	16.1	9.0	14.0
1955 ²do.....	221.9	44.5	22.2	12.6	10.6
Change from 1947 to 1952.....percent..	+52.2	+21.7	-11.5	+38.5	-18.6
Change from 1952 to 1955 ²do.....	+16.5	+24.0	+37.9	+40.0	+24.3
Change from 1947 to 1955 ²do.....	+77.2	+50.8	+22.0	+93.8	+38.4

¹ Excess profits tax on corporations was imposed as of July 1950 and expired Dec. 31, 1953.
² 1955 figures are for 4th quarter of the year, seasonally adjusted, annual rate.

Wages went up more rapidly than profits in the earlier period; profits took over the lead in the last 3 years. We were promised a business administration in the 1952 campaign, and that's what we got.

Excess profits taxes were imposed on corporations in the first period, taken off in the second.

Farm income fell \$630 million a year in the earlier period, \$1,150 million a year in the second. The business administration we were promised, and got, doesn't seem to treat farming as a business.

Most dramatic fact of the last 3 years is that total dividends paid out to corporation stockholders caught up to and passed the total net income of farm operators. That happened in the third quarter of last year. In the fourth quarter, dividends exceeded farm income by \$2 billion, or 19 percent.

Only once before have American stockholders received more income from their shares of stock than American farmers have earned out of their land and labor. That was in the years 1930 to 1932.

We were in trouble, deep trouble, in those years. Is there a warning to us in the fact that, once again, stockholding has become a more profitable occupation than the business of providing the United States with its foods and fibers?

II

Topic of your conference this year is the farm cost-price squeeze. Secretary of Agriculture Benson has been talking about that. More than once he has said that labor's wage increases have caused the rising costs that are hurting farmers.

I welcome the opportunity to refute that charge. But, in passing, I want also to comment on Mr. Benson's attempt to make farmers believe that the rising costs of the things they buy are hurting them more than the low prices they are getting for what they have to sell.

Mr. Benson's official publications, if you examine them, will show you that falling farm prices accounted for 12 of the 14 points by which the farm parity ratio has fallen since he took office—from 94 percent of parity in January 1953 to 80 percent of parity today. Rising industrial prices knocked only 1 point off of this parity ratio. Higher taxes and interest charges knocked off the other point.

Lower prices received and higher prices paid are the 2 jaws of the vise that is squeezing farmers. Figures published by Mr. Benson's Department show how the 2 jaws bite.

Farm prices were at 94 percent of parity when Mr. Benson became Secretary of Agriculture in January 1953. They are at 80 percent of parity today.

The indexes which his Department constructs for measuring this parity ratio show that:

1. Prices received by farmers fell 15.7 percent. If the prices farmers pay had remained stationary, this fall in prices received would have brought the parity ratio down from 94 percent 3 years ago to 79 percent today.

2. The prices farmers pay did not remain stationary. Prices paid for the commodities which originate on farms—food, feed, seed and livestock—went down 10 percent. This raised the parity ratio from 79 percent to 82 percent. Thus the combined net effect of falling farm prices over the 3 years was to reduce the parity ratio by 12 points, from 94 percent to 82 percent.

3. Prices farmers pay for industrial products went up 3 percent, on the average. This brings the parity ratio down from 82 percent to 81 percent. And that, to date, has been the total net effect of the price increases which Mr. Benson has been talking about.

4. Interest and taxes paid by farmers went up, on the average, more than 20 percent over these 3 years. This knocked the parity ratio down 1 more notch, to 80 percent, and that's where it is today.

5. Wages paid by farmers to hired labor went up 1½ percent and had only slight effect (two-tenths of a point) on the parity ratio.

Changes from January 1953 to January 1956 in indexes used by Department of Agriculture for computing parity ratio (1910-14 equals 100)

	January 1953	January 1956	Percent change
Prices received by farmers.....	268	226	-15.7
Prices, etc., paid by farmers.....	284	281	-1.1
Commodities of farm origin:			
Food and tobacco.....	266	260	-2.3
Feed.....	244	200	-18.0
Seed.....	264	228	-13.6
Livestock.....	341	270	-20.8
Weighted average.....			-10.0
Commodities of industrial origin:			
Automobiles (family use).....	285	301	+5.6
Motor vehicles (farm use).....	359	375	+4.4
Farm machinery.....	310	323	+4.1
Motor vehicle supplies.....	157	163	+3.8
Farm supplies.....	288	269	-6.6
Building materials and fencing.....	350	367	+4.9
Fertilizer.....	157	152	-3.2
Clothing.....	301	312	+3.7
Household operation.....	191	198	+3.7
House furnishings.....	275	273	-0.7
Building materials.....	380	398	+4.7
Weighted average.....			+3.0
Other costs:			
Taxes.....	371	432	+16.4
Interest payments.....	117	152	+30.0
Wages to hired labor.....	514	522	+1.5
Weighted average.....			+6.7

I don't want to make little of any increase in farmers' costs, especially under present conditions of farm income. The higher costs farmers are being forced to pay are not justifiable and I shall not try to justify them.

But unjustifiable as they are, and much as they ought to be stopped, I trust Mr. Benson will not persuade farmers to accept the present low level of farm prices as normal. Speaking at New Orleans last September, Mr. Benson said, "I am deeply disturbed by any action which adds even 1 penny to the production costs of farmers at this time."

We share that concern with Mr. Benson, even when he narrows it down to the last penny. More than that, we want to do something about it. We know, however, from figures published by his Department, that for every penny which higher prices of automobiles, trucks, and farm machinery have taken from farmers' pockets during the last 3 years, the falling prices of farm products have taken 20 pennies. We wish Mr. Benson had been deeply disturbed about that while it was going on—deeply enough to do something about it and to stop it.

Sharpest increase in all the rising costs imposed upon farmers over these 3 years was the cost of interest payments. They rose 30 percent. Mr. Benson did do something about that. He raised interest rates. To make the money supply tight and interest rates high has been an open and proud purpose of this administration. Mr. Benson has served that purpose loyally, on several occasions. He speaks with ill grace about other farm costs if he forgets what he and his administration have done to raise this one.

I propose now to refute Mr. Benson's charge.

III

For a general answer to the charge that wage increases have forced manufacturers to raise their prices, I rely on Annual Survey of Manufacturers published by the Census Bureau in the Department of Commerce, covering the years 1947 to 1953.

This survey shows that, for manufacturing as a whole, wages paid to production workers account for only 40 percent of the value added by manufacture. Value added is the difference between the sales value of manufactured products and the cost of materials, fuel, power, etc., purchased by manufacturers.

An important fact for our discussion today is that in most of the industries whose products constitute major cost items for farmers, wages took a smaller portion of this value added in 1953 than in 1947.

Value added in selected manufacturing industries and wages of production workers, 1947 and 1953

	[Dollars in millions]		Percent change
	1947	1953	
I. Steel works and rolling mills:			
Value added by manufacturing.....	\$2,276	\$4,626	+103.3
Wages of production workers.....	\$1,338	\$2,214	+65.5
Percent, wages to value added.....	58.8	47.9	-----
II. Motor vehicles and parts:			
Value added by manufacturing.....	\$3,577	\$6,938	+94.0
Wages of production workers.....	\$1,688	\$3,083	+82.6
Percent, wages to value added.....	47.2	44.4	-----
III. Tractors:			
Value added by manufacturing.....	\$332	\$678	+104.2
Wages of production workers.....	\$178	\$266	+49.4
Percent, wages to value added.....	53.6	39.2	-----
IV. Farm machinery (excluding tractors):			
Value added by manufacturing.....	\$422	\$582	+37.9
Wages of production workers.....	\$204	\$244	+19.6
Percent, wages to value added.....	48.3	41.9	-----

I think you will agree that when labor's share of the total manufacturing spread goes down, it cannot be accused of having forced manufacturers to raise their prices.

Perhaps the most interesting thing shown in these reports bearing on the relation of wages to prices is that labor's share of the manufacturing spread has been falling in the high-wage industries, like steel, automobiles, farm-machinery tractors and farm machinery, but it has been rising in low-wage industries like textiles, wearing apparel, paper, and leather. There are exceptions, but this is the general rule.

This may surprise you; it doesn't surprise us. High wages do not automatically translate themselves into high labor costs. On the contrary, the high-wage industries tend to hold labor costs down by using modern technology to make manpower more productive.

In any event, the broad evidence is that from 1947 to 1953 wage increases could not have been responsible for the price increases that occurred in the industries whose products figure most heavily in farm costs.

Since 1953, output per man-hour in manufacturing as a whole has been rising more rapidly than wages per man-hour. This was stated recently in a public speech by the Commissioner of Labor Statistics whose office has been studying the subject intensively. He says manufacturing output per man-hour rose 10 percent from 1953 to 1955. Average hourly wages of production workers in manufacturing rose 6 percent in these years.

These two facts together mean that although the wage per hour went up the labor cost per unit of output went down. This disproves the charge that wage increases have forced manufacturers to raise their prices.

Mr. Benson has his own opinion. He has said several times recently that our wage increases are larger than the gains in output per man-hour. As if he knew. Of course he doesn't know, but he had to say this in order to back up his unfounded charge that wage increases are compelling farmers to pay higher prices for industrial products.

IV

Now, getting down to cases, I shall be specific. Wage increases in the summer of 1955 were deliberately seized upon by important companies and industries as an opportunity to increase their prices without justification and try to make labor the scapegoat for their profiteering.

I start with the steel industry because that is where the profiteering parade started. In July 1955, the United States Steel Corp., leader of the industry, blew the whistle and the parade took off.

When United States Steel signed its 1955 wage contract, its prices were already so high that it was making profits one-third larger than in 1953, the best previous year in its history, and 73 percent above its average profits of the 7 postwar years (excluding 1952, the year of the long strike). United States Steel's profits after taxes when it signed the contract were double the average of the postwar years.

The price increase of \$7.50 a ton which United States Steel put into effect upon signing the wage agreement was almost three times as much as the cost of the wage increase.

It was worth at least \$95 million of increased revenue to United States Steel in the second half of 1955. Cost of the wage increase in the same period was around \$34 million. That gives you an idea of the money that can be made by parlaying a wage increase into a price increase—\$60 million in half a year.

United States Steel could have reduced its prices \$7.50 a ton for the entire year 1955, instead of raising them \$7.50 in the second half, and would have come out of the year with more profit after taxes than the \$222

million it made in the best previous year of its long history, 1953.

After raising wages and prices in July, United States Steel proceeded in the second half of the year to surpass the sizzling profit record it had established in the first half year.

The indisputable fact is that United States Steel has been, and still is, using the 1955 wage contract to fatten its profits at the expense of its customers—the industries that convert steel into the things which you and I buy.

This is a repeat performance on the part of United States Steel. It did the same thing with wage increases in 1949 and 1953 and 1954. Only it did it in a bigger way this time.

The rest of the steel industry has not been far behind United States Steel in turning the wage increase into a rich source of profits at the expense of its customers. Financial reports for 1955 from 11 of the largest steel companies show that profits (after taxes) of the industry as a whole will top the best previous year, 1950, by almost 40 percent and the 7-year postwar average by 75 percent.

	Profits before taxes	Profits after taxes
United States Steel Corp. profits:		
1st half 1955.....	\$356,878,000	\$177,878,000
2d half 1955.....	379,320,000	192,320,000
Year 1955.....	736,197,625	370,197,625
Best prior year, 1953.....	545,087,840	222,087,840
Postwar average (1947-54) ¹	412,933,000	177,138,000
Steel-industry profits, 20 companies having 90 percent of total steel capacity):		
1955, 9 months.....	1,412,400,000	712,300,000
1955, full year, estimated ²	1,996,900,000	1,007,000,000
Best prior years:		
1953.....	1,833,000,000	615,200,000
1950.....	1,500,900,000	713,000,000
Postwar average (1947-54) ¹	1,224,600,000	571,400,000

¹ Excluding the strike year, 1952.

² Based on full-year reports of 11 companies having 80 percent of total steel capacity, and 9-month reports of companies having 90 percent of total steel capacity.

The steel industry is private enterprise, but this kind of price gouging is no private matter. Higher steel prices become higher costs for many other industries. You and I don't often buy a piece of rolled steel as such, but whenever the price of steel goes up we pay it, again and again in hundreds of things we buy. As, for example, automobiles and farm implements.

Like United States Steel, General Motors announced last summer that its 1955 wage contract would force it to raise prices. Prices on the 1956 models were advanced about 5 percent.

This is undoubtedly the most fantastic example in the whole long history of wage-price fakery.

When General Motors signed the contract to raise wages 21 cents an hour, it was making a profit of \$3.20 for every hour worked by every one of its more than 400,000 production workers in the United States.

When General Motors told the public it had to raise prices, it was saying in effect, that it could not absorb this cost of 21 cents and hour out of a profit of \$3.20 an hour.

GM cracked the billion-dollar-profit barrier last year, for the first time in the history of corporations. Its profits of \$1,189,000,000, after taxes gave it a return of 35 percent on its investment. Its profits before taxes—the profits it collects from its customers—exceeded \$2.5 billion, 40 percent more than it had ever made in any year of its highly profitable history.

Instead of raising prices 5 percent in the fourth quarter, GM could have reduced prices 5 percent and still earn 16 percent on its investment.

Ford Motor Co. took similar advantage of the wage increase to put over higher prices on the public.

Earning \$3.06 in profit for every hour worked by its production workers, it said it could not absorb 21 cents an hour of increased wages.

The first financial report ever made public by Ford Motor Co. covers the 9 months ended last September 30. It shows that a 5 percent increase would have been worth \$197 million in that period, whereas a 21-cent-an-hour wage increase would have cost only \$45 million.

So they exact from their customers more than four times the cost of the wage increase and then blame their higher prices on the workers.

Ford, too, could have reduced prices instead of raising them. Its 1955 profits will be more than 2½ times its annual average profits of the postwar years.

	Profits before taxes	Profits after taxes
General Motors Corp. profits:		
1955.....	\$2,539,000,000	\$1,189,000,000
Best prior year, 1950.....	1,812,000,000	834,000,000
Postwar average, 1947-54.....	1,323,000,000	586,000,000
Ford Motor Co. profits:		
1955, 9 months.....	689,400,000	312,200,000
1955, full year estimated ¹	896,200,000	405,900,000
Best prior year, 1950.....	540,600,000	260,300,000
Postwar average, 1947 to 1954.....	345,900,000	158,100,000

¹ Estimated as 1.3 times the reported profits for 9 months.

Ford Motor Co. not only raised car and truck prices, it took the lead in launching a 7-percent price increase on tractors, which apparently set the price pattern for the farm-machinery industry.

What is the wage-price-profit picture in farm machinery? Profits are thinner in this industry. The reason is obvious. Too many of its customers are farmers.

However, we challenge this industry, too, to prove that it could not have absorbed the 1955 wage increase without raising prices. Harvester's latest financial report shows that if a 7 percent price increase and the 1955 wage increase had been in effect for all of the year ended last October 31, its profits would have been increased by \$30 to \$35 million, an increase of about one-third over the profits it reported. This is true despite the fact that in September Harvester fought a strike for 4 weeks before concluding an agreement with our union.

Oliver Corp. and Deere & Co. reports show that a 7 percent price increase will bring them more than \$1.50 for every \$1 of added wages paid under the new contract.

What steel price increases have done to the cost and profit position of these farm machinery companies their financial reports don't reveal. It certainly is important to them. It is through them that the disgraceful profiteering of the steel industry is passed along to you, the ultimate consumers.

The president of International Harvester, your guest speaker today, wrote an open letter to Secretary Benson last September, commending him on the New Orleans speech which sought to pin the blame on labor's wage increases for the trouble farmers are in.

I bring this up here because of the questions his letter does and does not raise. Mr. McCaffrey's letter dwells right heavily on the wage increases his company has paid. It puts less emphasis on the increased prices of materials, although the latter bulk considerably larger in their total costs. While the letter is generally critical of the wage increases, I can find in it no criticism or question of profiteering with regard to higher steel prices. On the contrary it describes

these material prices as "largely payments going to labor on other companies' payrolls." So labor is to blame for everything, even the profiteering of the steel corporations.

The fact is, as I have already shown, that steel profits did not require prices to be increased \$7.50 a ton, but would permit them to be reduced \$7.50 a ton, and still keep profits above the highest level of all prior years.

Concluding his letter, Mr. McCaffrey suggests to Mr. Benson that the farmers' "greatest opportunity to meet the market price of farm products and maintain their profit position lies in new and improved mechanization." Moderate changes in the price of a farm machine are, he says, largely irrelevant from the farmer's standpoint if the machine reduces his costs and improves his earnings.

I don't think farmers should be expected to meet the market price of farm products at present low levels, and I doubt that even the finest machines can make these low prices profitable. Organized labor quite widely believes, I am sure, that quick and effective action to get farm prices back up, and to bring farm incomes into line, is vitally important for farmers for labor and for everyone else.

But that won't do any good if the profiteering parade that was launched last year proceeds unchecked on its dangerous course. Raise farm incomes to the point where farmers become good customers again and they, too, become a set-up for price gouging.

This is no idle question. Even as the record-breaking steel company profit reports for the year 1955 are being released from day to day, the steel industry is talking about another general price increase.

"Steel Makers Say More Price Increases Are Coming; Claim Market Is in Good Position To Absorb Them." That's a headline in the Wall Street Journal of January 30.

As a matter of fact, steel prices have been edging up steadily since last summer's big increase. More and more of the so-called "extras" which steelmakers tack on to basic prices are being increased. They have added more than a dollar a ton to steel prices in recent months, one paper reports. U. S. Steel announced higher "extras" on plates, sheets, and strips on January 27. It is expected to boost prices on iron ore before the shipping season opens on the Great Lakes. Steel leaders are talking about the need of bringing prices into line with production costs.

Further steel-price increases will be seized upon by steel-using industries for further price boosts on their products, plus, of course, an addition to their own profits.

The executive board of my union, the United Automobile Workers, spoke out immediately last July when General Motors and Ford said they were going to raise car prices. It challenged the need for raising car prices, and it asked the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report to get at the facts behind these prices, including labor costs, and to tell the people of this country what was going on.

When Ford Motor Co. in August announced higher prices on its tractors we again issued a public protest and renewed our demand for investigation.

When Secretary Benson in September charged that our wage increases are forcing farmers to pay higher prices Walter Reuther wrote a letter to Benson denying the charges and asking him to join us in asking a committee of Congress to get all the facts, including labor costs, and lay them out on the table for the people to see and judge. Mr. Benson's reply renewed the charge, but ignored the request.

With steel prices edging up constantly and with another general price increase predicted, I think you will agree that full-fledged investigation of profiteering in these major industries is urgently needed.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, Mr. Montgomery points out that after the United States Steel Corp. signed its 1955 wage contracts, and with its profits already one-third higher than its best previous year, the company used the wage contract as an excuse to increase steel prices three times the cost of the wage increases.

Mr. Montgomery stated, and he has not been contradicted:

United States Steel could have reduced its prices \$7.50 a ton instead of raising them \$7.50 in the second half, and would have come out of the year with more profits after taxes than the \$222 million it made in the best previous year of its long history, 1953.

This study shows that General Motors, with its profits last year of \$2.5 billions before taxes and of \$1,189 million after taxes—a rate of 35 percent on its investment—could have reduced its prices last year by 5 percent instead of raising them by 5 percent and still would have earned 16 percent profit on investment after taxes.

The same sort of situation existed in other automobile concerns. Similarly, wage increases in the farm machinery concerns, which deal directly with the most depressed segment of our economy, were followed by price increases considerably in excess of any increased wage costs.

THE ECONOMIC PATTERN TODAY

Mr. President, the events that we see occurring in the economy today are frightening to those of us who can remember how past depressions have started, and how our march out of the depression of the early thirties was halted by profiteering of the great monopolistic corporations.

The pattern today is almost exactly the same as existed in 1937, when the Government was spending billions of dollars to stimulate the economy, to create employment and greater purchasing power. At that time, the big corporations moved in and began to skim the cream off the Government spending by unjustifiable price increases. All that was needed was their cooperation with the Government program, and willingness to accept reasonable profits. The spending programs had the economy so well on the way to recovery we had been able to reduce the makework appropriations some. But instead of cooperating, the big businesses started profiteering. They thereby cut purchasing power, started a new recession and forced the Government to renew its expenditures again.

We had an investigation at that time of the so-called sit-down strike of wealth against economic recovery, and its frustration of recovery efforts by profiteering.

Summarizing the findings of the investigating committee on the floor of the Senate on May 23, 1938, I said:

It will be seen from the testimony of all those representatives of finance and industry appearing before our committee that in 1936 and early 1937 business conditions and re-employment were advancing rapidly. All that was necessary for continued recovery was honest and unselfish cooperation, but unfortunately there was a lack of that necessary spirit of cooperation. Industry, in its interminable quest for profits, began to

make unreasonable advances in prices and otherwise failed to observe good judgment and sound economic principles. That is exactly what caused the recession in the recovery we are experiencing.

Continuing at that time, I said:

The present recession follows the classic analysis of the 1929 depression made by Brookings Institution. The testimony presented before our committee thoroughly established the conclusion that the unbalanced prices which developed in 1936 and 1937 caused the recession.

Robert W. Irwin, furniture manufacturer of Grand Rapids, Mich., testified directly that the recession was caused by the maintenance of artificial prices * * * Here is an impartial witness from the ranks of industry frankly acknowledging the cause of the present recession. Prof. PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of the University of Chicago, testified that the monopoly fixation of prices, which was clearly shown by undisputed facts, is the major cause of the present recession, as well as the 1929 depression. Prof. Alvin H. Hansen, of Harvard University, testified to the same effect.

It appears, therefore, from this general study of the testimony, that while the Government was seeking by the expenditure of billions of dollars to create purchasing power and stimulate industrial activity in the country, the leading industrial and business enterprises moved in to take advantage of the Government spending and enrich their own treasuries. Practically all of the leading industries began to raise prices shortly after the public-works program began. As prosperity began to return, wild excitement and speculation on the stock exchanges followed, and very soon, as a result of excessive prices and profits being made by the big industries of the country, the new boom began to develop.

This urge is nothing new. Adam Smith, 160 years ago, shrewdly remarks:

"People of the same trade seldom get together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public, or in some contrivance to raise prices."

The parallel between what happened in the middle thirties and the price increases and excessive profits which are being taken today out of the economy—and now largely out of the farmers' pockets—is emphasized by comments which the distinguished former Senator from Indiana, Mr. Sherman Minton, made during my address to the Senate in 1938.

This colloquy occurred between Senator Minton and myself:

Mr. MINTON. Did not Mr. Knudsen, the president of General Motors Corp., appear before the committee?

Mr. MURRAY. He did.

Mr. MINTON. I think the figures show that in 1932 General Motors made \$165,000; in 1936 they made \$238 million; and I believe the figure was even higher in 1937.

Mr. MURRAY. That is a correct statement. * * * As a matter of fact, practically every corporation in the United States made greater profits in 1936 and 1937 than at any time since 1929. A great many of such corporations made greater profits in 1937 than they did at the highest peak of our national prosperity in 1929.

Mr. Minton then summarized his point. I quote him:

Mr. MINTON. I wonder if the Senator will agree with me in the statement that Mr. Knudsen's company, General Motors, was one of the chief beneficiaries of the spending program, and a splendid example of what

the Senator has just pointed out. The corporation took all the profits for itself. General Motors, presided over by Mr. Knudsen, paid Mr. Knudsen two-hundred-thousand-odd dollars in 1934; three-hundred-thousand-odd dollars in 1935; and five-hundred-thousand-odd dollars in 1936. The corporation did not reduce the price of commodities to the public at all. It raised wages very little, but it raised the salaries of its own officers, and paid fat dividends to stockholders.

As I have already shown, General Motors Corp. profits last year, before taxes, were \$2.5 billion and, after taxes, they were more than \$1.1 billion. This is 5 times the rate which helped to bring on the recession of 1937.

There are those who contend that "what is good for General Motors Corp. is good for the country," but a continuation of the excessive profit take of such big corporations, at rates like 35 percent on investment after taxes, will lead to the same sort of economic trouble as it did in 1929 and 1937.

Back in 1938, Cleveland, Ohio's outstanding spokesman for business, the banker-economist, Leonard P. Ayres, recognized that business greed was behind recession difficulties. He testified before our committee:

Last spring (1937) there were many warnings about prices rising too far and too fast.

It is regrettable that the lesson this Clevelander learned in the experiences of 1929 and 1937 did not trickle down to those who were to succeed him in economic leadership in that community and the Nation. If it had, the present administration might be showing more concern about lower labor income, rising unemployment, and the serious deflation of the farmers.

Two answers are being made today to those of us who are concerned about the economic consequences of the present farm depression.

One is that farmers are not really in any difficulty. That is the line that Secretary of Agriculture Benson and editor John Fischer of Harper's magazine take: That farmers are still dwelling in a "clover and Cadillac heaven."

This assertion has been adequately answered here on the floor in this debate and by publications which support the administration but have too much economic intelligence to try to conceal the true situation for partisan reasons. For example, the February 10 issue of U. S. News & World Report, published by David Lawrence, portrays the agricultural situation as a very serious one. The article reveals a decline in net income per farm from \$4,301 in 1952 to \$3,800 last year and an estimated \$3,673 this year. It shows a 20-percent decline in farm spending between 1952 and 1955. It shows farm debts up \$4.3 billion in the same period and farm assets down from \$155.5 billion in 1952 to \$145.1 billion in 1955, a decline of more than \$10 billion. It reflects also the effect of increasing industrial profits in the continuing high prices of all the nonagricultural products which farmers must buy.

Only the political apologists for the present administration stick to this claim. It was interesting that the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], who made a trip to Iowa and then

appeared with Agriculture Secretary Benson on a 30-minute television broadcast last week, did not endorse the Secretary's claim that conditions in agriculture are basically good.

The second argument is that farm population is down and that agriculture's importance in the national economy has declined to the point that we can have a farm depression without ultimately causing a general depression.

Dr. John Davis, director of the Harvard University Graduate School's program on agriculture and business, who was an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in the present administration, has refuted that argument. In an address on October 17, 1955, to the Boston Conference on Distribution, Mr. Davis warned that while agriculture was once a relatively larger part of the national economy than today, a drop in farmer purchasing power will be felt significantly in terms of limiting our overall national economic potential.

Mr. Davis has coined a new word, "agribusiness," to describe the total of all operations concerned with the processing, distribution, and production of farm commodities. He stated:

Agribusiness is a major component of our national economy—employing about 40 percent of our total working force and producing about 40 percent of our gross national product. As already indicated, it currently encompasses annually some \$15 billion of manufactured farm production supplies, \$30 billion of commodities grown on our farms, and \$90 billion of consumer products in the form of food and fiber.

Leon Keyserling, former Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, recently made a careful analysis of the farm problem. In his study he points out that farm spending in 1951 was about 7.2 percent of our total national spending. The farmers bought 8 percent of the output of the chemical industry, more steel than the entire passenger-automobile industry, rubber products enough to replace the tires on 6 million cars, and the equivalent of 16½ billion gallons of crude oil—more than any other industry. He estimates that between 2 and 3 million workers outside agriculture are engaged in supplying farmers with these basic products and others.

Then he warns us:

The difference between a year of high prosperity and a year of substantial recession for the whole economy is represented by only a few percentage points. For example, during the 1953-54 recession, the decline in total national spending never exceeded about 3 percent. But the deficiency in market for products caused the true level of unemployment at its peak to rise to about 5 million, and our total national production to fall, at the bottom of the recession, to an annual rate nearly \$30 billion below the full production level.

CURRENT EFFECT ON THE ECONOMY

The effects of the decline of farm spending are increasingly appearing today in our economy.

Small business, and especially distributors in rural areas, are particularly hard hit. But employment in the big factories is also down, and in farm-implement factories employment is still steadily declining. The trade publica-

tion Implement and Tractor for February 11 reports that tractor output the first 6 months this year, originally scheduled at 177,000 units, has been cut back to 137,000—a reduction of 20 percent this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The time allotted to the Senator from Montana has expired. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield additional time to him?

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall be happy to do so. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield such additional time as may be necessary to enable the Senator from Montana to conclude his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. President, unemployment in the automobile industry is growing; layoffs since mid-December by the major automobile producers reached more than 72,000 by mid-February. I have just seen a study of new automobile registrations comparing 1950 and 1955—the industry's 2 biggest years—classified according to percentage of farm-owned cars.

In the 12 States where farm ownership of automobiles is highest, from 17 percent to 38 percent of all cars, there was an actual decline in 1955 in new automobile registration compared with the previous record year of 1950.

In the 12 States where the percentage of farm ownership of cars was lowest, ranging from 8 percent down to 1 percent of the cars in each State, the new car registrations showed a gain of 21 percent in 1955. The clear conclusion of the study is that the farm market for cars is off and that this is a major cause of the present increase of unemployment in the automobile industry.

The farm problem, Mr. President, is the concern of every one of us, because the health of the whole national economy is involved. It is urgent to every one of us, whether we be from an industrial State or a rural State, to see to it that the deliberate deflation of agriculture be halted and reversed and that farm income be rebuilt.

It is imperative, therefore, that we not only enact but strengthen those provisions in the measure now before us that will actually add to farm income and help to build agricultural income back up to the point required for a healthy national economy.

The only provisions of the bill which will do that—the only provisions which make a net addition to farm income—are those restoring 90 percent of parity supports for the basic commodities and restoring the old parity formula.

These provisions are opposed by the administration. We are hearing threats of a veto. These threats do not surprise me. It is a fact that if we stop the process of bleeding farmers to offset inflation in every other segment of the economy, as has been done consistently for the past 3 years, then the people of the Nation can no longer be deceived about the achievement of dollar stability. The inflation that has occurred in the prices and profits of the big, monopolistic businessmen who are here in the saddle

will then become apparent to the consumers. Of course, the administration would like to avoid a disclosure of the falsity of its stability claim.

But it remains to be seen if the President has been so misguided by those around him that he will risk the soundness of the economy in order to preserve a propaganda campaign claim among consumers.

THE SOIL BANK AND TRUE CONSERVATION

The soil bank proposals—the acreage reserve and the conservation reserve—will not add to net farm income immediately, as the economic situation requires.

Farmers are to get payments for not cultivating and not producing crops on a part of their land. It is purely replacement of income they otherwise would have received from crops produced.

The most the soil bank payments to farmers can do is create a temporary illusion of added income. I understand that efforts will be made to send checks to the farmers during the summer—before the election—to pay them for taking acres out of cultivation. But in the fall of 1956, when the farmers have less produce to take to market, they will all be aware that their soil bank checks were merely prepayment of income normally received at marketing time.

I am extremely doubtful of the soundness of the acreage reserve proposal from a conservation viewpoint.

This is a proposal to take out of production 10, 20, or 30 acres—a relatively small patch—on each farm which produces one of the basic commodities on which acreage allotments are in effect. The land that really needs to be returned to grass and trees does not necessarily lie in little patches on every farm.

A sound conservation approach to shrinking the total land in cultivation in the Nation would call for the retirement from cultivation of the poorest lands—the lands unfit for the plow.

The publication *Land Facts*, of the Soil Conservation Service, United States Department of Agriculture, shows that 39 million acres of class V, VI, and VII land are in cultivation. It is too wet, too steep, too stoney, or too arid for cultivation. Much of it has severe limitations even for grazing and should be in trees.

This land ought to be taken out of cultivation, and we should move on to the additional 47 million acres of class IV land which has very severe limitations for cultivation and would be better used if planted in grass or trees.

This land is of low productivity. But I seriously doubt that it would cost more to get 50 million acres of these marginal lands back to grass and trees than 15 million acres of land in the classes which are suitable for cultivation. We might very well get as much reduction in production per dollar out of a conservation program soundly based on land capability as from this proposal to have a little patch on each farm—to cover the face of the Nation with little "corn plasters."

Certainly the amendment proposed by my colleague the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to permit farmers to participate in the soil bank with off-farm land, when it

will bring about better land use or farm management, should be adopted.

Before another Congress convenes, the whole soil-bank program should be reviewed and reorganized. I would strongly favor the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry employing a competent staff to do this job, free of the partisanship over farm issues found at the Department of Agriculture.

Another very serious question about the soil-bank proposal is the extent to which it will actually shrink production and the extent to which the United States should curtail its food production in a hungry world, in which we are competing with the Communist ideology for the minds of men.

I am sure that all Senators are doubtful that reduction of cultivated acreage will actually reduce production proportionately.

This question posed itself acutely in my own mind when my attention was called to the Missouri Farm News Service, a clip sheet sent to all rural newspapers in Missouri by the College of Agriculture of the University of Missouri.

The clip sheet of articles for publication in the farm press is featured by a column-long story captioned "Intensive Cropping System May Help With Farm Problem."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, but I shall also summarize it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTENSIVE CROPPING SYSTEM MAY HELP WITH FARM PROBLEM

With higher prices for what he buys and lower prices for most everything he sells, the farmer is caught in the middle, says Stanley Spangler, University of Missouri agricultural economist. To relieve some of this pressure, farmers must cut expenses or produce more to sell.

One way a farmer may be able to produce more and at less cost for each bushel raised is by growing two grain crops in one year on the same piece of land.

In many years, a lot of corn has been planted the last of June or early in July. This late corn was usually planted as a result of a flood, a wet spring, or other delay-causing events. While late-planted crops are not always successful, in many instances they reach maturity and supply a lot of feed. In the case of corn, even immature grain can provide a lot of livestock feed as grain or silage.

Why not follow wheat, rye, or barley with corn or beans? The interest in investment, taxes, and overhead costs is no more for 2 crops than for 1. It looks like it would be a paying proposition most years, Spangler points out.

Of course, there are some drawbacks to late corn and beans. Some years, the ground is so dry following a small grain crop that corn or beans won't come up. Also, other crops may take a farmer's time and he may not have time for late plantings. Then, too, an extra-early freeze or frost may hurt a late-planted crop.

However, recent developments are making this intensive cropping idea practical as time goes by. First, there are more early seed varieties than formerly.

Second larger and better machinery speeds up field work. Combines are larger and more efficient, getting the small grain out of the field in a day or two. Tractors are more powerful and preparing a seedbed doesn't

take long. Also, some farmers have crop dryers or access to them.

Third, and important in making 2 crops in 1 year possible, is the use of heavier fertilizer applications. And adequate soil treatment greatly speeds up the crop's growth and maturity and gives fall-seeded crops a boost through the winter.

As a general rule, late-planted crops don't yield as heavily as early ones. But, they require less work, Spangler points out. Ground usually works easily and the weed problem isn't as bad. One cultivation usually takes care of weeds.

Crops to plant after small grains will depend on the needs of individual farms. If silage is needed, sorghum or corn are good choices. For a strictly cash crop, the answer is probably beans, while for feed to fatten hogs or steers, corn is best unless acreage allotments are a handicap. Then, maybe combine-type grain sorghums might be a good choice.

In summing up what is needed for success in this type of double cropping, Spangler says the following points need to be considered.

1. An early-maturing small grain combined on time.
2. Enough moisture for the ground to be plowed, worked down, and to sprout the seed.
3. A highly fertile soil plus plenty of commercial fertilizer. Two crops take a lot of plant food.
4. Enough labor and machinery to harvest the grain crop and get the next crop in speedily.
5. Moisture during the growing season and an average to late killing frost or freeze.
6. Livestock to utilize the crops as silage, as soft grain or in extreme cases, as pasture.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the article is based on advice to farmers by Stanley Spangler, University of Missouri agricultural economist, who found that farmers were caught in the middle by higher prices for what they buy and lower prices for what they sell. Mr. Spangler's article then states:

One way a farmer may be able to produce more and at less cost for each bushel raised is by growing 2 grain crops in 1 year on the same piece of land.

Because of Missouri River floods in past years, farmers in that State have planted corn as late as the last of June or the first of July, the article explains. So this economist suggests that Missouri farmers plant wheat, rye, or barley in the spring and follow it with corn or soybeans. If the second crops do not always mature, he suggests that they can be used for feed.

The article defends the feasibility and enumerates the advantages of growing 2 crops where only 1 was produced before.

Congress votes annual contributions to help maintain the State agricultural colleges. One cannot help but wonder how consistent we are to vote a billion dollars to reduce acreage and surpluses, and then appropriate several millions more for this sort of educational work.

In the early days of the Triple-A, this sort of inconsistency was avoided. Farmers in the old agricultural adjustment associations were partners in adjustment of production. It was a great mutual project to eliminate surpluses. Neighbors worked with each other across the Nation to whip the overproduction problem. But that day of farmer cooperation to meet jointly the production adjustment problem is gone. Today

Government workers encourage individual farmers to ignore the overall good of agriculture and attempt to beat the game as individuals. It is a formula, of course, to keep farmers divided and to make any farm program unworkable.

HOW FAR SHOULD REDUCTION GO?

The extent to which this Nation should reduce its production of foods and fibers, before making an all-out effort to banish want in the United States and the world, is one that should be considered thoughtfully.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] propose, by amendment of the bill, to establish a domestic food allotment or stamp plan to improve the distribution and increase the consumption of food by undernourished citizens of the United States. We should adopt such an amendment.

Although it cannot be done in connection with this bill, we should also pass Senate Resolution 65, which I introduced a year ago for myself and a large bipartisan group of Senators, to bring about the establishment of a world food and raw materials reserve.

Other free nations of the world have been attempting since immediately following World War II to achieve better international distribution of food—to combat hunger—through such a world food agency. Lord John Boyd-Orr, the first director general of the World Food and Agriculture Organization, led an international effort to establish such a world food agency. It failed because of the hesitance of the United States and Great Britain.

The nations in the World Food and Agriculture Organization and the International Federation of Agricultural Producers have continued, in effect, to petition the United States and other "have" nations—countries with surpluses that could help end hunger—to join in a world-food program.

The International Federation of Agricultural Producers, meeting at Nairobi, Kenya, in 1954, established a committee which is soon to report again on a new program for attainment of their long sought world food reserve goal.

I am deeply concerned about the effect that drastic curtailment of food production in the United States will have around the world.

Two-thirds of the world's people live in nations which have not finally made their choice between democracy and communism. These are the people of South and Central America, Southeast Asia, Africa, and the Middle East, where so-called stomach communism—the false promise of enough to eat—holds its greatest allure.

We should be doing everything we can to win these people. We should be leading—not just meeting Communist moves—in the campaign for their allegiance. But, we have not only failed to respond to the polite entreaties of these peoples to let our surpluses go into a world food reserve, although it would help to solve one of our own serious domestic problems; we are now proposing to spend vast sums of money to prevent the production of food that men,

women, and children in this world desperately need.

Unless the adoption of the soil-bank proposal shall be accompanied this session by positive moves to share our potential abundance with the have-not nations of the free world, I fear that the cause of freedom from want, the cause of world democracy and world peace, will have been seriously impaired.

I shall discuss other features of this bill as appropriate amendments come before the Senate.

In view of the economic situation of agriculture and its potential effect on the whole economy, I feel the reenactment of 90-percent supports for basics and restoration of the old formula for calculating parity should be supplemented with programs to assure a better farm return on feeds, livestock and animal products and other commodities.

In spite of the administration's apparent willingness to let farm income sink further, to offset more profits for General Motors and its other big business allies, we need to rebuild farm income not merely \$1 billion a year, but several billion.

I shall support amendments which have been proposed which will mean additional net farm income. Such aids to farmers will be far less costly than either a recession or a depression.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 2884) to amend the wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

EXCUSAL OF PAGES FOR REMAINDER OF THE DAY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief request, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without losing my right to the floor, I may yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am advised by some of the pages that they have an exceptional amount of studying to do, for some reason or other; and I ask unanimous consent that all but two pages on either side of the aisle may be excused for the remainder of the afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I object to that request. I should prefer that there be a quorum call. I understand why the Senator has made his unanimous-consent request, but I believe that every Member of the Senate, and particularly Members on the other side of the aisle, need a lot of education about the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, my request concerned only the pages.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then I misunderstood the Senator's request.

Mr. LANGER. I referred only to the pages.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I misunderstood the request. I withdraw my objection and ask that all my remarks pertaining to the request may be deleted from the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the request of the Senator from North Dakota is granted.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3183) to provide an improved farm program.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield, so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, first of all I should like to propose an amendment to the bill, S. 3183, which is in the nature of a substitute for the soil-bank provisions of the bill. Actually, this is the language submitted originally by the American Farm Bureau Federation, with some slight changes. It was offered by me in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and was rejected by a vote of 9 to 6. I still think it embodies something the Senate will want to consider, because it is a mandatory soil-bank provision. Surely, if we are to have the type of price levels which have been in effect, it will not be possible to obtain a reduction in acreage on a voluntary basis. For that reason I desire to have before the Senate, when it shall consider the soil-bank question, the amendment to that provision which I desire to present.

I submit my amendment and ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, many of the things I intend to say today may not deal with the whole philosophy of the bill, but may relate only to certain isolated sections, and statements which have been made about the measure.

I have previously expressed on the floor my admiration for the way in which the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the chairman of the committee, conducted the hearings. Therefore, if I refer to a statement he made on the Senate floor, I am sure he will understand I do it only for the purpose

of trying to bring out points I think should be emphasized.

The Senator from Louisiana made the following statement, which I read from page 3164 of the RECORD for February 23:

It would not stimulate production of the basics because, as Mr. Benson well knows, he has in his hands all the tools he needs with which to control production of the basics.

I say only that the Secretary cannot bring the basics down to a matter of control. He is prohibited from bringing wheat acreage below 55 million acres. All that would be necessary next year, in the absence of that provision, would be 18,580,000 acres.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. When I made that statement what I had in mind was this: Whether or not there were flexible price supports, or 90 percent of parity price supports, the Secretary of Agriculture would have the same production control devices available to him. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, I think that is a correct statement. All I am trying to say is that he does not have available to him the tools with which to control production.

Mr. ELLENDER. The pending bill does not propose to reduce the acreage in wheat below 55 million acres except through the soil bank. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, but it will not bring that about through the soil bank provision with 90 percent support prices, because no farmer growing wheat is going to be stupid enough to take his wheatland out of production in the soil bank and lose 90 percent support unless there is a mandatory provision commanding him to do so.

We have had indicated the desire year after year to increase the amount of wheat acreage under 90-percent price supports, and even under 85-percent price supports. It strikes me that when we know the Secretary cannot keep production under control, we have to be more careful when we start to vote on high price support levels.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator intend to propose any amendment which would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to cut wheat acreage further?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. I tried that one time. I tried to have wheat acreage brought down to 55 million acres at a time when every Member of the Senate knew it ought to be brought down to 55 million acres, and that amendment was defeated. There was no desire then to bring wheat acreage realistically into control, and I would say there is no desire today. After one bumps his head into that kind of opposition a few times, he abandons such an undertaking.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I have such a very high regard for the Senator from New

Mexico that I hesitate to interject at this time, but it seems apropos to ask a question now. Does the Senator feel that with present 76 percent of parity for 1956, and the soil bank, there will be any reduction in wheat production this year, except as to spring wheat?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think there will be a reduction of wheat acreage as regards spring wheat, unless there is in the law a mandatory provision for a soil bank—a compulsory soil bank. The American Farm Bureau Federation, which spent 3 years studying the soil bank, came up with a pretty good answer, namely, that the farmer must be willing to make some adjustment before we consider the rates of pay he shall get for doing it.

If there is a mounting pile of surpluses, it is easy to say we have to do something about it. I have been critical of the Secretary of Agriculture, and I intend to be critical again, if we do not see the present surpluses begin to disappear; but I am trying to say, in an effort to be fair, that the Secretary of Agriculture is not in a position to handle the situation as we think it should be handled. We will have full planting of wheat this year and for many years to come, and that must be handled in one of two ways. About all the wheat land that is necessary to take care of our domestic needs for food, feed, seed, and a small amount of extra, is about 40 million acres. The rest of what we produce is to be turned into export; and the record of the International Wheat Agreement is for anyone to read. We began with 55 cents. We were told, "Only a few pennies will get this wheat into circulation." Thereafter, we came up to 65 cents. We are now an 87-cent subsidy, and still our wheat will not move in international trade. We are going to need a subsidy of \$1 a bushel; and then if some other country stimulates its wheat production, we again shall face the problem of how much further to raise the subsidy.

I say again that I do not think it is wise—and I do not think the Senator from Kansas wants to have it done, either—to keep forever increasing the subsidy, in order to try to shove into world commerce the surplus wheat production which we have at the present time.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, let me say that I am in thorough accord with what the Senator from New Mexico has said about our wheat problem. It is a very serious one. I have every reason to believe that it will not be long before the taxpayers of the Nation will object to paying a \$1 a bushel subsidy, and I think rightfully so. It is for that reason that I favor a referendum as to whether we should have domestic parity. I wish the Senator from New Mexico would discuss that point.

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall, although I promise that I shall not detain the Senate all day. Of course, once a person begins to discuss this problem, there is a great temptation to continue the discussion a long time.

But I say to the Senator from Kansas who is just as much concerned about the farm problem as I am, and just as anx-

ious to be helpful as I am that I know very well that the day will come when the taxpayers will assert themselves, if we keep on subsidizing wheat and if we increase the subsidy to \$1 a bushel. They may remember that not so long ago the price of wheat was \$1 a bushel. I do not want to lose all the farm programs the United States has. I say, on the basis of experience, that I think these programs will be jeopardized if a high subsidy on wheat is to be paid.

I had the experience of dealing with the program on potatoes. No one contended that potatoes were not good food, but it was simply impossible to bring potato production in the United States under control, either at 90 percent of parity or finally at the support price of 60 percent. New areas came into potato production—not at all the old potato-growing areas. Those new areas had a perfect right to come into production.

However, one of the interesting things I remember from that experience with potatoes is that the head of a chainstore told me that at one time his store bought potatoes in only two States—Maine and Idaho; and he said, "It will interest you to know that for the next year we will not have a bushel of potatoes from either Maine or Idaho."

I say such distortion of the agricultural picture is bad.

In the case of wheat, the supply is so great that, following the established formula to make available a quantity equal to a year's domestic consumption and exports, plus 30 percent after allowing for carryover and imports, only 19 million acres could be grown in 1956. But the Secretary is required by law to issue allotments based on 55 million acres.

For upland cotton, the formula in the law to make available a normal supply, after allowing for carryover, would give something less than 7 million acres. But the Secretary is required by law to permit the planting of more than 17 million acres. I think there is some question as to whether the Secretary of Agriculture needs to use that figure; but he did have that authority this year.

For rice, the formula to produce a normal supply, after considering the carryover, would give 936,000 acres. But the Congress enacted a law requiring an acreage allotment of not less than 1,639,000 for 1956.

For peanuts, 1,454,000 acres would be needed, based on compilations specified in the law to produce the average number of tons of peanuts harvested for nuts in the preceding 5 years, adjusted for current trends and prospective demand. But the Congress has said that the Secretary must issue allotments based on 1,610,000 acres—not far out of balance in the case of that rather minor crop.

The Secretary of Agriculture has acted in good faith in imposing production controls as required by law. But the law itself has required that many more acres be kept in production than are needed to get supplies up to the so-called normal levels.

In addition, we could analyze these laws and could try to ascertain what happens under them. But as I have

pointed out, every time we come to the point where someone says, "The economy of the State simply cannot stand it," we are tempted to reply, "That is not very important. We will just pass the bill."

In July of last year we passed the rice-control law. I pointed out that it was unreasonable to cut the rice acreage more than 15 percent. But the law was passed. Of course, that law means that in 1954, when the Secretary of Agriculture saw a mountain of rice, and when the Department did not impose controls—and I think the Department acted properly; but certainly as the matter now stands, we see that it acted wrongfully—we got into all kinds of trouble.

However, I should like to say that situation is not unusual, and it is not a partisan situation. I think a Republican Secretary of Agriculture failed to put quotas on rice; I think a Democratic Secretary of Agriculture failed to put quotas on cotton. I am simply trying to say that this is a problem which arises in every administration, and it is one which is not too easily and too quickly handled.

Therefore, today I am going to suggest that we should not be too critical of some of these programs. In the past few years, and particularly in the past few weeks, I have heard a number of Democrats say much about the program of flexible price supports; they have described it as a frightful program which had been thrown on the American people by Mr. Benson. I think a word or two might be said about that. A few minutes ago the able junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], in speaking on this floor, referred to a Democratic President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt. The Senator from South Dakota said Mr. Roosevelt held office as President longer than any other man in the history of our country. Of course, time after time I have heard Democrats speak quite well of Mr. Roosevelt, and I have been one of them. I find nothing wrong in President Roosevelt's program on agriculture. Many times I have said that I thought Franklin D. Roosevelt was as fine a friend as agriculture ever had in the White House. But I can recall that it was in the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt that flexible price supports first became effective. I think it is worthwhile to remember that. In the Agricultural Act of 1938 we had price supports which were flexible from 52 to 75 percent of parity. Today we tend to forget that fact. So, Mr. President, when we say that the man who at the moment is Secretary of Agriculture has given the American farmer price supports which can flex only downward, frequently we are tempted to forget the fact that there was a previous time, when there was also a provision for flexible price supports. It was when a President who was nominated 4 times by the Democratic Party and elected 4 times by the American people was in the White House.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me at this point?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I appreciate the Senator's reference to the situation in 1938, 1939, and 1940. Some of us remember

those years very well. Is it not the history of the flexible price supports which we had at that time, that they did not reduce production?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, I do not think they reduced production, because we had not reached the point where the farmer was getting parity. In that period of our agricultural existence we were only trying to give the farmer a support level so that he could have orderly marketing of his crops. It was when we arrived at the concept of paying the farmer from the United States Treasury, the concept of producing crops for the Treasury, and not for the trade, that we began arguing about levels of price supports. One of the first agricultural votes I cast in the Congress was for a 90-percent price-support level, which at that time was designed, I thought, to be a stimulant to production and a guaranty to the farmer. That was relatively late—in 1941 or 1942. But during all the previous years, when we had been dealing with this problem, we had not been trying to establish a support level which was so high that it supplanted the marketplace.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not a fact that, disregarding the question whether high or low supports increase or reduce production—and I believe that high supports do increase production, although I am not so sure that low supports decrease it, because every farmer likes to raise as big a crop as he can—when prices are made realistic, consumption and disposal increase tremendously?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that is true.

Mr. AIKEN. The situation relating to dairy products is one of our most recent examples. When the price of butter was such that the consumer had to pay 80 cents or more a pound, the consumer went on strike. The dairymen lost 500 million pounds of our butter market. When the price was reduced 8 cents a pound, in 2 years time they recovered 300 million pounds of the 500 million pounds of lost markets. So realistic prices do increase sales and consumption, whether or not they decrease production.

I may also say that so far as high prices are concerned, they do definitely increase production. We had a little experience in New England last fall. Following the very hot weather in August when milk became scarce, the price went up, and it looked as though the price of milk would hit \$5 a hundred in September. The dairy farmers increased their production so much to take advantage of the \$5 price, that the expected increase did not materialize at all. Instead of an increase of 66 cents a hundred, they got an increase of about 4 cents a hundred. Through the fall, when milk was selling at \$5 a hundred or more, the farmers fed extra allotments of grain to their cows. They went into Canada and bought a great many more cows than usual, and brought them in and milked them. Some of the cows which were brought in in September were probably paid for by the first of February. However, the upshot was that production was increased, and they had

to take a lower price this spring. Now the price is dropping. The dairy producers are disposing of their cull cows. They are selling something that should have been sold some months ago.

Consequently, it looks as though next fall the price would be back up to a very satisfactory level. I hope the experience of last fall will not be repeated. I hope that dairy farmers will not have more cows producing more milk, bringing about a lower price a few months later.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will say to the Senator from Vermont that when we were holding hearings on the general farm program for 1954 I asked about this very question, as appears on page 1258 of the hearings. I pointed out at that time that the announcement of a high price level meant that the total number of milk cows had jumped from 35,270,000 to 37 million in a period of about 4 years.

At that hearing, 2 pages later, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] asked the Secretary of Agriculture this question:

Senator THYE. Mr. Secretary, last year you announced the support price at 90 percent on dairy products and we wound up by enjoying about 82 to 84 percent of parity. What is going to be the situation this year with a 75 percent support level? What are we going to wind up receiving?

Testimony was given before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry a few days ago that the level had reached 86 percent. So it is not the stated level that counts. It is what actually finally happens to the farmer.

The Senator from Vermont and I joined in a resolution in an effort to make sure that the farmer received the full amount of parity—not merely the dairyman who sold his product to the United States Treasury. The resolution did not pass. He and I know why it did not pass. There was a great deal of opposition to it from people who had a stake in keeping agricultural prices from being reflected to the farmer.

The statement was made by the junior Senator from Minnesota a day or two ago to the effect that no one had ever proved very conclusively that high price supports actually stimulate production. I do not intend to deal with that question at very great length, because it is very difficult to trace the relationship between price and production. If, as in the rice industry, for example, there is an enormous expansion in commodity because of a high price level and the absence of controls the producers continue to produce even if the price level drops suddenly. They have to. They have bought new types of rice harvesting machinery. Collectively they have invested millions of dollars in new machinery. So it requires a long time for the effect to display itself. I have some figures which might be of interest. In the year 1946 we had a very great shortage in linseed oil. Manufacturers of linoleum came to the Department of Agriculture and said, "Our industry will virtually have to close down, and the paint and varnish industry will be in trouble, unless you can find us some linseed oil. There is plenty in the Argentine, but there is none in the United

States, and we cannot get a supply sufficient to take care of our needs."

In 1946 the planted acreage of flax was 2,641,000 acres. The price during that year was \$4.04. The then Secretary of Agriculture asked the producers what price would be required to stimulate production. Telegrams were sent to farmers in Minnesota, the Dakotas, and other areas where there is usually a large flax production. The producers said that a price of about \$5.75 a bushel would do it. That was a jump from 115 percent of parity to 160 percent of parity.

What was the result? The acreage jumped from 2,600,000 to 4,200,000 acres. The next year it was 5,100,000 acres, and the following year 5,348,000 acres. The next year prices came down a little, and flax production was somewhat less.

I do not know how we can trace the effects much better than that. Those figures are available, as are figures on a great many other products. The table with respect to dairy products is very interesting. If I have the time I should like to insert a great many such figures in the RECORD.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator spoke about flaxseed. I invite the attention of the Senator from New Mexico to the fact that between 1942 and 1946 the average price of flaxseed was \$3.01 a bushel. The price went down, and there was a shortage of linseed oil. In 1947 the price was \$6.15 a bushel, and soon there was plenty of flaxseed. The shortage was undoubtedly caused by the fact that the price was only \$3 a bushel over a period of several years.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the Senator is correct, then everyone who surveyed the situation was wrong. Those who came into the office of the Secretary of Agriculture all told the same story: "If you increase the support level on flax you will get an outpouring of flax that will take care of our situation."

I established a level which was far beyond what we had ever had. We got increased plantings of flax immediately, and as soon as we got the figures as to the plantings, we proceeded to buy oil from the Argentine, because the Argentine realized that it was up against a real competitor.

Mr. AIKEN. In 1947 the average price was \$6.15 a bushel. In 1948 the price was \$5.71. There was a tremendous production. We obtained enough flaxseed to last for several years. That has now been disposed of, and the price of flaxseed is again going up this year. The support price is going up. I think flax is an excellent example of how variations in the support price do cause production to go up or down. Flax is probably one of the best examples.

Mr. ANDERSON. The only difficulty is this: If we try to trace the relationship between price and production with respect to one commodity, we must take into consideration what is happening to some other commodity. When the acreage of cotton and wheat was reduced, there was, of course, an expansion into grain sorghums, rice, and many other products, which did not bear a relationship to the price, but bore a relationship

to whether the commodity was or was not under control, and whether the acreage was such that it could be diverted from the production of crops which had been normally grown on those acres to the production of other crops.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I do not care to enter into a discussion with respect to flax. I am not familiar with that crop. However, I wonder if the Senator will agree with me that when there is a reduction in the price of a farm commodity, the farmer must have a certain amount of income in order to have economic operation of his unit, or at least to live, based upon the cost of labor, machinery, taxes, and so forth. As the price goes down, is there not a tendency on the part of the farmer to try to increase his production, instead of decrease it?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. The point is that we try to regulate enormous swings, enormous transfers of acreage. After World War I there was a great reduction in wheat acreage, because the price went down to a ridiculously low figure. For a long time those lands went back to pasture. When wheat prices again rose, we experienced a long-term swing which produced many millions of acres of wheat. Once land is planted to wheat, it is not quickly taken out of wheat production.

The question of agricultural income is one I have worried about for a long time. I have referred many times to the chart which has been placed at the rear of the Chamber, and I shall continue to refer to it, because it illustrates, I believe, that the farm problem is somewhat complex, and cannot be easily solved. Indicated on the chart is the period which follows the base period. Then there will be noted a sharp increase in farm income, as there was also in national income. This point on the chart—indicating the years 1914–20—refers to the First World War, when very high prices for food-stuffs were paid to us by foreign countries.

When World War I was over, immediately there was a terrific down-plunge in farm income—indicating 1920–21. Then we had a period during which banks were closing all over the country, and all through the farm areas. Everywhere we turned we saw banks closing, including banks that had always been regarded as very sound institutions—indicating 1921–24.

At that time I was living in a farming community in which 5 of the 6 banks closed. The sixth bank was kept open by nothing short of brute strength, because the people of the community realized that they had to have some place in which they could do business. Then there was a long period of years in which farm income and national income stayed fairly parallel—indicating 1924–48.

Then they declined together in the period to which I am now pointing on the chart—1930–32.

Then we had—as is shown on the chart for years 1942–45—a level farm income, because it was easier to control farm prices than industrial prices. At

that point it was realized that some adjustment had to be made in all other prices.

Farm prices stayed down. Once the war was over it was possible for farm prices to catch up again with industrial prices, and they stayed together until the end of 1948.

In 1948 we had a tremendous corn crop. At that time there was much of discussion about storage facilities, and much of uncertainty attended the market. Then there was a sharp drop in prices, as is shown by the chart to which I am referring—1948–49.

During the year 1950—beginning in June—we were in the Korean war. The prices of agricultural commodities turned up by the end of the year.

In 1951, because of demands for additional supplies, prices turned sharply up. In 1952 they started down again. Then they went very sharply down and have continued downward.

What I hope the friends of farmers will realize is that most of the drops I have shown on the chart came about under 90-percent price supports.

If 90-percent price supports are the absolute guaranty that some people think they are, why did farm income drop away so drastically from all other income? In the recent drop only two commodities were below 90-percent support levels; whereas the great bulk of the commodities were at 90-percent support levels.

The very least one can say is that 2 big drops came under the 90-percent level, and 1 drop came in part under flexible price supports.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. During which of these years was the Senator the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is a loaded question. During this period shown on the chart—1945–48.

Mr. LANGER. Did prices go up or down?

Mr. ANDERSON. They went up. However, I must say to the Senator from North Dakota that the prices went up because we removed controls, and because we had enormous requests for agricultural commodities from other countries. Those factors simplified the problems of the Secretary of Agriculture at that time. In other words, it was not hard to be Secretary of Agriculture at these points—1914 and 1947—on the chart, but it is very hard over here—1952–56.

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Will the Senator from New Mexico explain what the policy was between 1930 and 1940, when the farm percentage-wise income twice reached the same level as the national income?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe it was due to a brief attempt to reenact something to take the place of the old farm bill—

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. The McNary-Haugen bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, but I am thinking primarily of the Federal Farm Board.

That came into effect along about here—1931—on the chart, and it had something to do with trying to stabilize the market. It did not work. The Farm Board could not buy enough to keep track of it, and prices went down materially.

In 1933 and 1934, the farmers insisted upon some kind of agricultural control. Many people at home and in Washington were clamoring for something, and there was enacted the Agricultural Adjustment Act, with a processing tax. The Supreme Court knocked it out. Down came agricultural income. Then there was some strong testimony in 1936 and 1937 in behalf of a new farm program. I am happy to say that there was bipartisan support for the movement on both sides of the aisle, and there was some assurance that a good farm bill would be enacted. It was enacted in 1938.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Was that the Soil Conservation Act?

Mr. ANDERSON. It involved soil conservation; yes. It was the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Mr. ELLENDER. With price supports. Is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. It involved price supports of from 52 to 75 percent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How does that program, which was so successful, differ from the program which is now being offered?

Mr. ANDERSON. The supply of cotton in the United States reached almost a record peak in these years—1936-38—on the chart, and it was not possible, apparently, to find markets for it, and for a great many other agricultural commodities.

At that time Henry Wallace went before the American farmers and to Congress and asked for a soil bank. His thesis was that when the ever-normal granary begins to overflow, we should store the grain in the soil. In that period Henry Wallace steadily contended that Congress had to do something about the establishment of a program which would allow the Government of the United States to pay a man not to produce something.

Of course, the Senator from Wyoming may remember that in that period there was a good deal of discussion of Henry Wallace's proposal to plow under every third row of cotton, and there was a great deal of discussion about what he wanted to do to little pigs.

Interestingly enough, when the present Secretary of Agriculture recently testified on the soil-bank proposal, someone asked him what he intended to do about wheat already planted. He said it could be plowed under and used as green manure.

Henry Wallace said cotton could be plowed under.

Strangely enough, the same persons who criticized Henry Wallace for suggesting the plowing under of cotton are not now so critical about plowing under wheat.

At that time Henry Wallace recognized the fact that we would reach the point where we would not be able to control agricultural production merely by levels of price supports or anything of that nature, but that it would be necessary

to enforce acreage allotments, and he also proposed that there be established something that is almost identical with what we now call the soil bank.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was not adopted.

Mr. ANDERSON. It was not adopted. It ran into vigorous opposition because Mr. Wallace was associated with the program of milk for Hottentots, and things of that nature. Of course, I do not know the difference between sending whole milk to Hottentots and sending condensed milk to Hottentots. It all goes to the same "tummy." But, as the Senator will remember, Mr. Wallace was under considerable fire at that time because of his proposals.

If I had the time I could deal with what he said about acreage and point out that excess acreage is still a problem. This country is faced with an excess of from 10 million to 25 million acres of crop land, which should be left idle.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was dealing with the Senator's graph more than with the history of the Wallace proposals. About 1939 the line of the farmer's income began to turn up again, did it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Because of contracts, when we were rebuilding our war plants.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We were beginning to be drawn into World War II at that time.

Mr. ANDERSON. We were beginning to construct airbases and factories.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So that it was necessary to get more production from the farms at that time, rather than to restrict production, was it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. That started the curve of national income going upward. One of the things we have learned is that the best market the farmer has is probably his domestic market. When workers are earning good pay they purchase more agricultural products. There is nothing in the world in this respect that takes the place of a good paycheck. When the Department of Agriculture sent a team to England in 1939 or 1940 to try to make a study of what happened to England when it got into the war, the group brought back a little pamphlet entitled "The Theory of Underconsumption." It dealt with the problem which arose in England as soon as workers began to receive good salaries.

The first thing a worker does when he is put on a good salary basis is to stop eating only flour and potatoes; he begins to buy other types of nourishing food, foods which are not only nourishing to him, but are beneficial to his family.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then increased consumption by the American worker has nothing to do with the present plight of agriculture?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. But in the period I have referred to we began to see an extra quart of milk at each door. Two quarts of milk instead of one quart were consumed.

I should like to remind the Senator from Florida that when the worker reaches his highest point of financial return he makes the greatest demands on extra nutritious fruits, such as citrus fruits and other commodities of that nature which are produced so abundantly in the Senator's State of Florida. It

depends upon the level of income. When the American workingman reached that level he realized that the things he had to discard when he was short of money were the very things his children should have had.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield at that point?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I noticed the Senator from Wyoming stated that the increased standard of living had nothing to do with the present plight of agriculture. I would say that the increased standards of the American consumer are going to have a great deal to do with relieving the plight of the American farmer. For instance, when the price of hogs dropped to about 12 cents a pound the consumption of pork started upward, and in the past 2 months, whereas consumption had been approximately 64 pounds per person, it has gone up to 80 pounds. But even though we produce as many hogs as we did last year, it is rather unlikely there will be a better price in the market because of the increase in the consumption. It may not have an immediate effect on the price paid the farmer, but in the course of a few months or a year it should have considerable effect.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A beneficial effect.

Mr. AIKEN. As the Senator knows, the consumption of beef increased very rapidly after the decrease in the number of cattle which was anticipated did not materialize.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Increased consumption, by and large, is beneficial to the farmer.

Mr. AIKEN. There can be no question about that.

Mr. ANDERSON. We can all agree on that. It is the one great market the farmer has. We cannot blame the plight of the farmer upon what happens in an individual case.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield at that point?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Before the Senator leaves the point he has been discussing, I wonder if he would answer a question or so as to the effect about which he has been speaking. We have noticed that around 1940 and 1941 there was a slight rise in the income of the farmer. Necessarily that was because of the fact that people bought more and ate more.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. To what does the Senator attribute the rise up to the highest point in, say, 1948?

Mr. ANDERSON. I said, frankly, that I attributed it to the fact that there was a tremendous demand for agricultural products, and price controls had been taken off.

Mr. ELLENDER. Consumption was at high levels both at home and abroad; was it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is quite correct. As a matter of fact, we had to export 500 million bushels of wheat during that period, and the Government paid more than \$2 a bushel for it—in some instances as much as \$3 a bushel.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator tell us at what period, from 1940 on, price supports were imposed which tended to increase production?

Mr. ANDERSON. I have felt many times that the imposition of 90 percent supports in that period of years helped to increase production. If it did not, then Congress wasn't very wise, because Congress passed a 90-percent support resolution, and stated the purpose at the beginning of the resolution to be "to increase production immediately."

Mr. ELLENDER. I suggest to the Senator from New Mexico that I placed in the RECORD last week some excerpts from speeches made by those who asked for higher price supports, and they were asked not only on the assumption that they would encourage production, but in order that the farmer might receive his fair share of the national income. Does the Senator disagree with that?

Mr. ANDERSON. If I can find the so-called Steagall amendment—

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what I had in mind.

Mr. ANDERSON. Was it not initiated with the idea of an immediate increase in production?

Mr. ELLENDER. It dealt with non-basics.

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope the Senator from Louisiana does not feel that the chart I have here relates only to basic commodities, which represent a very small portion of the national income and farm income.

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume that the Senator is trying to demonstrate that high price supports had a great deal to do with the ups and downs in agricultural income, particularly after 1948, about which he has been speaking.

Mr. ANDERSON. No. I tried to show that the drop in 1948 came about when there were 90 percent supports, and the later drop, theoretically, was when flexible price supports were operative, but the support price was nearly always 90 percent.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator not agree that in 1947 there was no limitation on what a farmer could plant?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I cannot agree with that statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. There were practically no allotment programs until 1950, as I recall. The sky was the limit on production. And prices were up. As a matter of fact, the 90 percent support law meant little to the farmer, because nonbasics, as well as basics, were selling at over 90 percent.

Mr. ANDERSON. I realize that most commodities were not under control, but it is my impression that tobacco remained under control a good deal of that time. I think some other commodities remained under control, but most of them were uncontrolled. I grant that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was the drop in 1948, to which the Senator has referred, not due to the fact that large surpluses had been accumulated during the war, and that sales had diminished to the point where surpluses were unmanageable? Would the Senator not agree to that?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I would not, because at the end of 1947, if the Senator

will look at his statistics, we had swept the cupboard clean so far as wheat was concerned. We went down to the lowest carryover of wheat the country has ever known—to 87 million or 89 million bushels. That was true as to a great many other commodities.

If the Senator wants my explanation of the 1948 situation, it is rather simple.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to have it. The Senator indicated it was due to the 90-percent supports, or had something to do with the 90-percent supports.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I did not blame it on 90-percent supports in the slightest.

Mr. ELLENDER. To what did the Senator attribute the condition?

Mr. ANDERSON. I said these things happened when there were 90-percent supports, and they happened when there were flexible price supports.

I blame it on the large corn carryover. Of course, I am speaking only from memory; I do not spend as much time on the statistics today as I once did. But there was a corn crop of 3,600,000,000 bushels, when we had had 3 billion bushels the year before. We had the greatest outpouring of agricultural commodities, and as a result there was a rumor throughout the land that agricultural prices needed to be shaken down.

I shall not go into all the details, but a former Governor of New York and former Governor Stassen emerged from a conference, and the Republican candidate for President made the statement that agricultural prices needed to be shaken down. Shortly thereafter the Secretary of Agriculture dropped out of the market and did not do much buying. I do not know who ought to be blamed, or whether anyone should be blamed.

Certain persons have said that if the Secretary of Agriculture had continued to buy corn when the corn crop was harvested the situation which ensued might not have resulted.

But between politics on one side and agricultural economics on the other it was not possible to determine who was responsible. However, the farm program became squarely involved in a national election, and there was a great deal of comment about whether farm prices should be shaken down or not shaken down, and the farmer got blamed for what happened.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the Senator is not blaming what happened on price supports, is he?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I am not.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I notice that farm income as shown on the chart has dropped very rapidly from 1951, when it was more than \$19 billion, to \$11 billion in 1955.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think in 1952 it was actually \$17 billion, and net farm income was down to \$10.6 billion at the end of 1955.

Mr. CARLSON. I was simply trying to picture the figures at the distance I am standing from the chair.

I should like to inquire about the millions of acres which farmers took out of allotment acreages. For instance, with respect to wheat, it was 23 million acres.

We find that 16 million acres of other crops—corn, oats, barley, and sorghum—did not bring a greatly increased production of livestock, which would have seriously affected the income of the farmers of the Nation.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, it did exactly that. The interesting thing is that it produced a shift in the spot where livestock production might be expected to have been the highest. I am not referring now to the range country. But back in the period to which we are referring it could safely be said that more beef would be made—fattened beef at least—in the State of Iowa than in any other State. Yet the average number of cattle on feed on an Iowa farm was 10. That was not our concept of large feeding operations at all.

Yet when other crops and other commodities were developed in other areas of the country, agricultural production and beef production began to shift into new locations; and the people who had been in business for a long time found themselves with a whole new crop of competitors. The result is that a very bad livestock situation exists.

I do not think it was possible for feeders to make any money until the last year or so because of that factor. In my opinion, so long as the problem of diverted acres stares us in the face—and I look now at the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who has proposed that something be done about diverted acres—we shall continue to have all sorts of agricultural distress and loss of agricultural income.

Mr. CARLSON. On that very point, is it not reasonable to assume that it makes no difference whether there is rigid parity or flexible supports, when a situation of that type arises, and the production of commodities or crops is shifted from one area to another area?

Mr. ANDERSON. I have said, time after time, that no agricultural program will work with the kind of surplus situation that exists at present. I do not care what kind of program is in force; it will not work.

I was about to refer to rice.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. In August 1952, I think, the parity level of farm income was about 113 percent. I am not certain whether the month was August, but, at any rate, the figure has dropped from 113 percent to 80 percent in December 1955 and January 1956. Now it is up to 81 percent.

I do not know if we can point specifically to any month when the flexible price supports took effect, but let us say it was about the middle of last summer.

Mr. ANDERSON. It was only to a very minor extent.

Mr. AIKEN. Of the 33 points drop in farm income, approximately 29 or 30 points took place when the 90 percent supports were in effect. The drop since that time has been due largely to the drop in feed grain and hog prices.

The drop in feed grain and hog prices is due primarily to the fact that the wheat producer was required to cut out

some 24 million acres which he used for producing wheat and plant it in feed grains, which broke the price of feed grains and the hog market. One can trace that directly, without having to do much tracing, either. It is due directly to the high rigid supports which induced overproduction of wheat.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I particularly appreciate the Senator's reference to the amendments which I have offered in the past seeking to provide compulsory handling of diverted acreage so as to prevent the happening of what has happened recently. Diverted acreage has brought headaches to the producers of other crops—both to the producers of allotted crops and the producers of unallotted crops. One result has been the production of so much feed grain, for instance, as to greatly increase the supply of cattle and other livestock, which has brought headaches all the way down the line in the field of agriculture.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico if it is not true that one of the reasons for objecting to some of the provisions of the pending bill is that, along with the proposed restoration of 90 percent price supports, which is the greatest possible inducement to overproduction, the bill does not propose a strict across-the-line compliance which would do away with the very abuses to which the Senator has so properly adverted.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree completely with that statement. I say to the Senator that one of the difficulties with the farm program is that while practically everybody says he is in favor of putting controls on agricultural prices, actually that will not be done, because when we get down to the question of whether or not we will stand for a program, Congress may adopt one, and the President may sign the bill, but the program will be kicked out before adequate opportunity is afforded to see whether it will work. It is not possible to have enormous overproduction year after year and not have a drop in farm income. That is why, unless we decide to do something effective and stick to our plan, we shall not get rid of the problem. We must get rid of the farm surpluses and bring production under control. When that is done, we shall have a price range which will be above parity, where it was before we were confronted with the problem of surpluses.

We cannot refer to the surplus question and say it is due to the piling up of commodities under a previous administration.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Does the Senator believe the soil bank can be made operative in this calendar year so as to affect to any great extent the surpluses, or potential surpluses, should weather conditions be favorable?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know whether it can be effective now, but with a fairly high range of supports, no soil bank will become operative. The only

way a soil bank can be made operative is to make it mandatory, and then it will work only if the temptation to evade all controls is not too great.

If we are going to try to trim down, we must do it on some sort of mandatory basis, and in order to make it work, we must expect that the farmer will profit from it. That is why I say it cannot be made operative unless something is done about the surplus situation. If we allow the storage of rice without some disposition being made of it, and then establish a soil bank for rice, the farmer is not going to be interested.

Mr. THYE. Does the Senator believe that farm prices will correct themselves in this calendar year, and not drop lower? Will a lower price not go into effect as the first application for a wheat loan or corn loan is made in the calendar year 1956?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know. It will depend on what the Department of Agriculture decides to do on two fronts. If it decides to dispose of surpluses, and really attempts to do so, and not merely sweep them under the rug, then I think farm prices will improve.

As the Senator probably knows, I was the only Senator who voted against the set-aside when it was put into the last law. I do not believe a set-aside which pushes the surplus away, but leaves it in existence, is going to have a good effect. People who are smart enough to trade in grain stocks know that, so long as 29 million hundredweight of rice are on hand, establishing a soil bank is not going to give good results.

Mr. THYE. I heartily agree with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. There cannot be any question that surpluses are an overhanging threat to our markets. The Senator from New Mexico and I are in full agreement that this is the serious problem with which we are now confronted. My only concern is that we in the Midwest are in a surplus producing area, and we do not have a vast population which is able to consume our production, as is true in the East and in other areas. Therefore, the farmers in our area are immediately confronted with the problem that a price drop of 27 cents a bushel for wheat and a price drop of 18 cents a bushel for corn this year will be reflected in price reductions of feed grains.

Until there is a reduction in overall production, prices are going to continue to drop. That is the reason I believe that in this crop year of 1956 we need the so-called 90-percent price supports to keep prices from going lower.

My good friend, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] felt that I should not be advocating a 1-year extension of 90-percent price supports. He said I might be accused of doing so for political reasons if I suggested it be done for only 1 year. Well, the Senator from Florida was kind to me. He was trying to do me a service, so I would not be accused of making a move for political reasons, and he cautioned me against suggesting that it be done for only 1 year. Consequently, the provision for 2 years was written into the proposed legisla-

tion, so as not to bring a political question before us.

The Senator from New Mexico and I know positively that it is the surpluses burdening our national markets which have weakened prices, in the face of the Nation's prospering economy, with record-breaking wholesale and retail sales, and the greatest purchasing power on the part of the consumer which has ever been seen. Therefore, if we could erase the surpluses, our agricultural commodities would reflect, I am sure, 100 percent in the market place.

Mr. ANDERSON. When the Senator says that, he strikes a very responsive chord, if we could just erase the surpluses. On the first day the Senate was open for business I introduced a resolution, in the hope of providing a definite plan for the disposition of surpluses. It contained a provision that the Secretary should report 60 days after a certain law became effective. But by that time we would be through another crop year.

What I wanted to do was to have a program adopted which would pledge the Secretary not to allow one bale of cotton over a certain good housekeeping level to flow into the markets; to take away everything above 3 million bales and agree to move it into other markets, as we are starting to do now. If he would do that, and see to it that in 4 or 5 years of proper disposal we got rid of surpluses, we would find it the greatest stimulant for better prices we ever experienced.

I read what the Senator said about dairy support prices, to the effect that, although the level was fixed at 90 percent, the price received was about 83 or 84 percent. That is correct. I am prepared to say that even trying to fix a high level will, in the end, work against the farmers. I think the best thing we can do for the farmers at the present time is to make a pledge to get rid of the surpluses, and require the Secretary to try to get rid of them within a period of not more than 5 years, and preferably within 4 years. True, it will mean enormous losses, but the very large loss today is being taken out of the hide of the farmers. I think the very first thing we need to do is get rid of the surpluses, and the second thing is adopt a mandatory soil bank that would absolutely shrink acreage and give the farmers payments for it.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further at that point?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I share the conviction of the need for a mandatory soil-bank program. I advocated it 3 years ago, and I was ridiculed by some and accused by others of trying to regiment agriculture. But everyone who has any commonsense and who applies it in connection with farm operations and farm production, knows that our farm plant has been too large, and that there is only one way to bring production down, namely, by decreasing the number of acres which are tilled. If that is done, of course, many of the young couples whom we would like to keep on the farms will have to stop farming.

They will be eliminated because their credit is limited, for one thing.

But I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico—who probably is one of the best informed persons on agriculture in the United States—whether he believes that the 90 percent supports are a factor in the development of the surplus.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not like to start debates, but I think that is so.

Mr. THYE. Then I should like to ask this question: In the 1920's, we did not have any kind of farm program. At that time we did not have price supports; we did not have acreage allotments; we did not have any mandatory provisions. During those years we had very little knowledge of the use of commercial fertilizer. At that time our corn planters were still set at 42-inch rows, and some of them were set at 44-inch rows. At that time we did not have any modern machinery, such as the efficient combines which are in use today. Yet, if we read the debates which occurred on this floor in 1924, 1925, 1926, 1927, and 1928, we find that they are almost identical with the debates we are having today as we discuss the question of why the surplus must be controlled, and what has caused the low prices in the marketplace. At that time there was no farm program; yet that was the question which was before the Congress. I know the Senator from New Mexico is aware of that fact.

That is why today I am in complete accord with the soil-bank provision, and that is why I am in complete accord with the provision for \$250 million to move the surpluses, and that is why I am in complete accord with what the Senator from New Mexico says, namely, that we must get rid of the surpluses, and that we should make it mandatory for the Department of Agriculture to take steps to get rid of them. I share the view of the Senator from New Mexico.

However, knowing that in the 1920's and early 1930's we accumulated surpluses, although at that time we did not have a farm program, I am at a loss to know how anyone can say that 90 percent supports were the incentive which brought on the surpluses with which we are confronted today.

Mr. ANDERSON. I say to the Senator from Minnesota that I have tried to keep from bringing that question too firmly into consideration here. I have a conviction about it, and so does he. I have been trying to say that I do not believe we shall solve the farm problem by trying to tie a tag to one particular thing or by necessarily adopting one particular recommendation.

We have four large farm organizations. I am sure all of them try to help the farmer. In their recommendations, they are split apart as far as they possibly can be. The Farmers Union favors 100 percent of parity and unlimited acreage, and so forth. The Farm Bureau wants a mandatory soil bank and flexible price supports. Under those circumstances, I do not know how to expect the Members of the Senate or the Members of the House of Representatives to know what is best.

In the second place, I wish to point out that in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry—as the Senator from

Minnesota knows—we had more splinter parties than does the Republic of France. In the committee we were dividing almost entirely on every vote—showing that it is very hard, and I say it sincerely, to come into agreement on many of these matters.

However, there must be a few fundamental things upon which we agree. I do not object to the level of price supports the farmer gets, if we give him a chance to help solve the problem. But we shall never give him a chance to do that if we do not get rid of the surpluses, in the first place; and, second, if we do not have machinery by means of which to keep production under control.

In the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy we have heard testimony to the effect that by means of the use of atomic energy it will be possible to increase tremendously our agricultural production from the same number of acres now under cultivation. Under these circumstances, are we going to allow our agricultural production to go higher and higher? Furthermore, I understand that the Department of Agriculture has made studies which show that there is enough known technology, now unused, to boost the national average yield of cotton up to 700 pounds to the acre. If that happens, and if at that time we still have 18 million acres of cotton under production, and if each of those acres produces an average of 700 pounds, what shall we do with the surplus then?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is bringing out some very pertinent points in connection with the agricultural problem.

I know, and I realize the distinguished Senator from New Mexico also knows very well, that today's dairy animal is the result of intensified breeding. At first that animal was intended by the Creator to furnish sufficient milk only to feed its offspring. But today we are aware of the much greater production that has been accomplished by means of scientific breeding. Similarly, we know that tomorrow our experiment stations will develop new varieties of grains, and will increase the production of grain. There is no question about it. Furthermore, the atomic-energy era will further expand our production.

But the point is that so long as the farm plant has the potential of producing more than we can consume domestically or more than we can barter or dispose of in the international field, then in some manner we must assist the producer in an orderly way to bring the farm plant to a proper size. Congress must assist in that work, because no individual farmer can accomplish that. The Senator from New Mexico may have gone out of the dairy business, as I think he has—

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, I have.

Mr. THYE. But his going out of the dairy business did not limit dairy production in his vicinity.

Mr. ANDERSON. No, indeed.

Mr. THYE. Another farmer may have gone out of the pork-production business, but that does not limit the Nation's production of pork. There must be a national program, and the Government

is the only one that can initiate it and assist in its formulation.

The soil bank and the other provisions of the pending bill constitute the first sound, intelligent approach I have seen to solving the farm problem. I say that in all sincerity, and this is my 10th year of service here. Furthermore, I know something about farming, even though I have been classified as a chicken farmer. Nevertheless, I do know something about general farming.

I know that the farm plant will not be reduced in size sufficiently until we retire from production some of the acreage now under cultivation, and that must be done even before the atomic era comes into application in connection with farming.

The Senator from New Mexico and I know the farm problem. He is a former Secretary of Agriculture; and not only does he have a basic knowledge of the Department of Agriculture and of agricultural production and research activities, as carried on through the Extension Service and the experiment stations, but he also has had broad experience in practical operations in these fields. He and I differ on two points. I favor 90 percent of parity for 2 years, until the surplus is disposed of. He favors flexible price supports at once, to be applied in 1956, by means of announced supports on wheat, corn, rice, cotton, and so forth. So he and I differ only in regard to what might amount to 3 or 4 percentage points in the case of supports. Otherwise, he and I are in complete accord in regard to the fundamentals of the pending farm bill.

I criticized Secretary Brannan when he was Secretary of Agriculture because he did not dispose of pork when we had a surplus of it in 1951 and 1952. We have already noted the criticism of the past year. We know what the pork situation is at the present time. The Department has bought pork, and it has disposed of or assisted in disposing of surplus pork. Today for the first time we are making an intelligent approach to bringing the farm plant into balance with domestic needs. If we bring it into balance we can throw price supports out the window, because we shall never need them.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree with the Senator that if we do those two things we shall never have to worry thereafter about the level of price supports.

Mr. THYE. Positively not, because they would be a forgotten factor if it were not for the surpluses which are depressing the national markets.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. When the colloquy started between the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Minnesota the Senator from Minnesota asked a question, and I should like to go back and ask the converse of it. The question, in substance, was this: Does the Senator from New Mexico believe that if the bill were passed with flexible price supports, it would permit the acreage to be reduced, and would have some force and effect on farm prices this year?

I should like to ask the reverse of that question. I am well aware of the interest of the Senator from New Mexico in the farm problem, and his great knowledge of the subject. In the opinion of the Senator from New Mexico, if the bill were passed with rigid high supports, would that in any way tend to diminish the surplus? Does the Senator know of any way in which it could diminish the surplus?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I know of no way in which it could.

Mr. ALLOTT. Second, does the Senator know of any possible way that the adoption of such a policy could strengthen the income from farm products?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I think not, because I believe we would run into exactly the same situation in which we now find ourselves.

Mr. ALLOTT. So we have a choice of two methods of proceeding. I think we are all pretty well agreed as to the surpluses. We can call them reserves for the well-being of the country, or anything else. Nevertheless, they are still stacked up, and they are still depressing the agricultural economy. So we have two choices. If we go one way, there is no chance of helping either the price of farm products or the surplus situation; and if we go the other way, there is a chance of helping both.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it was pointed out in the hearings that the corn price-support level was \$1.34 or \$1.35 in one of the counties of Minnesota. Someone asked what the market price was. The price was \$1.10. I do not know what good the support price did, so long as the farmer was receiving \$1.10.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; but I wish to continue to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THYE. The Senator referred to Minnesota. I thought I probably could add to the discussion by saying that the man who complied with an acreage quota could obtain \$1.51 as a commodity loan on every bushel of corn that qualified for sealing. That is a long way from \$1.05 or 85 cents a bushel.

The man who did not qualify, the man who planted as many acres as his land would permit him to plant, was not qualified to get a commodity loan. He had to take what the cash market offered him. He figured that he could gamble, and probably get more money at the end of the year by staying out of the program than by going into it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I remind the Senator from Minnesota that the Secretary of Agriculture testified that 76 percent of the farmers did not comply. Noncompliance was not limited to some casual farmer down the road. Three-fourths of the farmers would not go under the program.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, had there been a soil-bank program in 1955, through which the farmer could have had some place to put his diverted acreage and receive some return with which to pay his taxes, interest, and overhead, he would have been in compliance. But with no soil-bank program, he could not

afford to comply, and therefore he did not. Consequently, I say that we must have a realistic approach to this whole question in order to resolve the surplus problem. The soil-bank plan is that approach.

Mr. ANDERSON. By the same token, if Congress had adopted the realistic farm program passed by the Senate in 1948 and allowed it to become law, we would not be in the fix we are in today. We start on these programs, and abandon them halfway down the road.

Mr. THYE. The soil-bank feature was not in the 1948 act. I say that as a practical approach, if we deny a farmer the right to grow an acre of corn, an acre of wheat, or an acre of cotton, and do not establish penalties with respect to the use of such diverted acreage, he will shift into sorghum grains in the Southwest, into barley and oats in the Northwest, and into either soybeans or corn in the southern cotton area. The result will be that we shall be only shifting the responsibility for surpluses from one area to another. When the agricultural plant is too big, it can be reduced in size only by intelligently controlling acreage and the production of farm commodities.

Mr. ANDERSON. Many of the things involved in the soil bank can be done under existing law. Very little additional law is needed to make it work.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think the point I wished to make has been pretty well covered, but I desire to repeat it. With the present support price on corn, under the present situation there is only 76 percent compliance.

Mr. ANDERSON. There is only 24 percent compliance.

Mr. ALLOTT. Seventy-six percent of the farmers are out of compliance, which accounts for the low price of corn.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is as I remember the testimony.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I concur in the statement of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. I think he very accurately described the problem which confronts a great many farmers of South Dakota. His statement expressed the real problem.

I am informed that there will be less compliance with respect to corn planting next year than there was last year. A 15-percent acreage reduction has been announced.

Mr. ANDERSON. The allotment is 43 million acres; and the least we can expect is that 55 or 56 million acres will be planted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That creates a terrific problem for the man who has an investment in a corn picker and other equipment. I think the percentage of compliance in South Dakota in 1954 was 40 percent. In 1955, it was possibly 50 percent. This year, however, it may not be as much as 10 percent. The farmer simply cannot get enough income to meet his fixed expenses. That is where he is caught.

Let me pose one question to the Senator from New Mexico. I heard the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] speaking of the soil bank plan as something to assist in making the transition. He was in favor of a 2-year continuation of the 90 percent program, in order to provide a period of transition. I recall hearing the Senator from New Mexico state—or perhaps I read a statement to that effect attributed to him—that for once he would like to see a farm bill passed before the farmer has his crops already in the ground.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have said that, and I agree with the Senator, I say that if the soil bank is ever adopted by the Congress, it will be a voluntary plan, under which I may announce that I am going to reduce my acreage; and when my neighbors reduce theirs, I go ahead and plant as much as I can.

Every farmer will think he will outfox his neighbor. We cannot blame them for it, either, because they are all in the same situation the Senator is talking about. If we do not get the law passed before the first of April, then of course it will be too late to have it do any good, because crops are being planted in many areas of the country.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. With respect to wheat, in some sections of our country winter wheat is raised, and in other sections spring wheat is raised, and it is impossible to fix the exact date. Therefore, it seems to me that there is a sound basis for a provision in the bill which will assure the farmer a cash income which will help him meet the price squeeze in which he finds himself. Whether it should be a program of 1 year or 2 years, or for a different period of time, I do not know. However, it seems to me that a transitional period is necessary.

Mr. ANDERSON. We went all through that in 1948. At that time, the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] introduced a bill on a bipartisan basis, because it was sent to him by the then President of the United States, and the President had received it from the Department of Agriculture. A great many persons thought it was a sensible proposal. We got all the farm organizations together, and they all agreed to a modernized parity and flexible price support program. Of course some of them changed their minds later on but all of them at that time were in agreement. The Senate passed the bill. However, in conference, the House said, "Give us 1 more year. Give us 1 more year. We will not ask for an extension again."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I recall being called to a conference at 3 o'clock in the morning on one day.

Mr. ANDERSON. They said, "Give us just 1 more year. We will never ask for it again." We gave them 1 more year.

Then in 1949 the Senate passed another bill. The House had adopted the Gore amendment. Again we went to conference. In conference it was said, "Just give us 1 more year. Only 1 more year. We will never ask for it again. Just give us 1 more year. Just one. Give us just 1 more year."

When that year ran out—

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Korean war broke out.

Mr. ANDERSON. Then when that year ran out, we were asked, "Give us just 2 more years. Give us only 2 more years. We will never ask for it again." When we got through that period we were asked, "Just give us 1 more year. We will never ask for it again."

Now we are in the 2-year cycle again. We are being asked to extend it for just 2 more years.

Mr. President, I have no faith in any such proposal. I believe we had better meet the question before all the farmers see their farm income go down to zero.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to say that I cannot too strongly commend the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for the various points he is making. They are all keyed to the principal point, that the surpluses overhanging the market are the principal problems with which we must deal.

The Senator is absolutely correct in his statement that an artificial set-aside or anything of that nature is nothing more than a shell game which both the farmer and the trade who handle agricultural products are much too smart to be taken in by. It is the old shell game of "Now you see it; now you don't. Now you have it under your hand; now you don't." Both the farmer and the men in the trade know that a set-aside does not do away with the menace.

Therefore I join the Senator from New Mexico, first, in his insistence on a quicker handling of surpluses, and that that be made the first undertaking, and the first problem to be met.

Second, I join with him in insisting that the first approach to that problem is through the soil bank. I join with him in believing that it should be on a compulsory basis, rather than on a voluntary basis.

The third point is this. Am I correct in understanding that the distinguished Senator feels that instead of assisting in doing away with surpluses, the restoration of 90 percent price supports for the basic crops for 2 years would do the exact opposite, in that it would give the maximum inducement and the greatest possible incentive for the farmer to produce just as much as he could produce from his acreage, and to overproduce, in the same way that the potato farmers did once when we were confronted with the same problem?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; but I do not believe what the Senator has said applies only to the basic crops. I do not believe that we will be able to get rid of an amendment to take care of lightweight hogs, oats, rye, barley, grain, sorghums, and other crops.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from New Mexico. However, am I correct in my understanding that the Senator feels that restoration of 90-percent price supports for 2 years would do the exact opposite from what it is claimed it would do, and that it would not attack the surplus problem at all, or dispose of it, but would, instead, tend to restore and enlarge the

surplus crops to which the 90-percent formula applies?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, I believe that to be the case. However, I wish to remind the Senate once more that there is a problem which is far more important than the problem of worrying about price supports, and that is the problem of what we will do with the surpluses.

I had hoped that the Senate would adopt the resolution I had presented to the Senate, so that we could have the Secretary's reply when we took up the debate on the farm bill. We did not do so. However, if we do nothing more than adopt a resolution which requires the Secretary of Agriculture to come back in 60 days to tell us what he will do about the disposition of the surpluses, I do not believe that action alone will affect farm prices supportable by 90 percent. A great many people believe that it would raise farm prices. However, what will we do with 29 million hundredweight of rice—unless we start to give it away?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I especially wish to commend the Senator from New Mexico for calling our attention to the fact that the basics are by no means all the agricultural production. They constitute only about 23 percent of the total cash marketings of agricultural production in this country. After taking out tobacco, which is not in argument in this particular debate, only 19 percent is affected when we talk about basics going back to 90-percent price supports.

I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico if he believes it is not merely a coincidence that most of the prosperity in agriculture at this time—and there is a great deal of it in particular places and in particular commodities—is in large part derived from agriculture crops which do not fall under the head of basics, but do fall under the head of production in which the farmer still uses some intelligence and still is trying to shape his planting against needs, and is using his ingenuity in marketing and distributing his products and in creating byproducts for which there are new demands?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not correct to say that the agricultural industries which show high prosperity at this time fall entirely outside the range of basic commodities, and that there are a considerable number of agricultural industries which are showing high prosperity because they are still planning, thinking, and working for themselves?

Mr. ANDERSON. I submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the other day a table showing the citrus fruit situation, with respect to which the State of the Senator from Florida is a very good example. I pointed out that although the citrus production had greatly increased, the producer was not in trouble, because he had found other and new uses for his product. When the domestic consumption of table fruit, or fruit eaten at the table, did not increase, the producer increased greatly the amount of fruit which went into packages, cans, and jars, as well as the sales to other parts of the world. He had to do it because the price support was below 50 percent, and he could not depend on the price-support

program. Therefore, he had to find markets.

Of course, it is not so simple as that with some other commodities. I will say that now before my friend, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] calls it to my attention. I do say, however, that if we would take care, when bills come to the floor, not to pass apparently little provisions which put us in trouble each time, we might have a better chance later of avoiding difficulties of the kind we are now facing. A short time ago we passed three little tobacco bills. They were signed the other day. I ask Senators to wait and see what those little bills will do. We will soon see what the effect of some of those little bills will be.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for his reference to the citrus industry. I admit that our citrus growers were hard pressed. They have accomplished much for themselves. I am happy, also, to say that theirs is not the only industry which has done much for itself. There are numerous other fruit industries—deciduous fruit and dried fruit, for example—and also other industries like the dairy industry in most parts of the country, which have done much for themselves. Incidentally, the dairy problem is confined largely to about seven States. The other States of the Nation are taking care of their dairy situation.

Mr. THYE. Under Federal orders. Under virtual monopolies. It would not be possible to carry so much as a gallon of milk into certain areas if it were not for Federal orders.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thought the Senator from New Mexico had yielded to me, but apparently I have been laboring under a misapprehension.

Mr. THYE. I am sorry.

Mr. HOLLAND. I see on the floor the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS.] He represents an area which has helped itself to solve its problems. Other agricultural areas which have helped themselves are those of poultry, dairy, small-fruit production, vegetables, garden crops, and others. That has been true in California, Florida, and in numerous other States where garden crops and small fruits and tree fruits and tree nuts constitute the largest agricultural industries.

I recall that in a recent colloquy my distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] remarked on the fact that my comment in committee was somewhat persuasive to him in getting him to drop his demand for a 1-year continuance of 90-percent price support on the ground that it was so apparently and translucently political that it would show itself.

Mr. ANDERSON. No member of the Committee on Agriculture would be political in any way.

Mr. HOLLAND. I approve of that afterthought statement of the Senator from New Mexico. But I wish to ask this question: Admitting that holding out the prospect of supports at 90 percent of parity for 1 year is a tremendous political bait in certain areas for certain people, does the Senator think that doubling the bait and making it applicable

for 2 years, not only for this year but for next year, and saying, "We who are fighting for you are going to put your business on a basis of 90 percent price supports," is any less political or less persuasive as a political argument in those areas to those people who, I think, are very few in number, but who are susceptible of political persuasion in this field?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I do not. I think the only solution is to come to grips with the question. It would be better for us to come to grips with the question of what we are going to do with our surplus products and our expanding agricultural production.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I regret that I interrupted the Senator from Florida. He is always a gentleman, and I want to treat him as such. But I should like to say, with reference to the market situation, that we in the Midwest are a surplus-producing area. Unfortunately Florida is getting many of our citizens who have the financial means to retire and who leave us and go to Florida. So the population of Florida is increasing, and therefore the State has increased numbers of consumers at the expense of those of us who live in northern regions.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, we in Florida are happy to have people from Minnesota come to our State. They are as fine citizens as can be found anywhere.

Mr. THYE. And we regret to lose them. But when the Senator's State enjoys a large fluid-milk consuming market he is not faced with the question of disposing of surplus dairy products. We cannot, however, ship our fine grade A milk to Washington or New York—milk which meets the standards of the Food and Drug Administration—because there is a regulation against it.

But what I want to say is simply this: The soil-bank plan is the first realistic approach to governing the number of acres to be placed in production and to controlling that acreage which has been diverted. We will not be able to get production down to reasonable proportions until we cease to till, or curtail the number of acres which are presently in production annually. Until such time as the soil bank is operating and we can fully retire acreage from production, we are going to have surpluses. In the 1920's and early 1930's, we had no farm program on the statute books; we had no price supports of any kind. Yet, men like Senator McNary and Representative Haugen, the sponsors of the McNary-Haugen bills, and even President Coolidge and those who assisted in writing his veto message, referred to the surplus as the only major factor which was then creating a depression in American agriculture.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is in this Chamber, and I believe he could draw upon his memory and recall the debates which took place on the floor of the Senate with reference to the surpluses which were then destroying the farmer's markets.

No price-support factors were involved in the problem then. Therefore, I think those who say that 90 percent price supports are responsible for the present surpluses are not drawing upon the experience of yesterday, because in the 1920's and early 1930's there were neither supports of any kind, nor any kind of a farm program, yet surpluses existed as the number one problem. Then, as now, there were surpluses that destroyed the farmer's market. The soil bank is a realistic approach to the problem, but we cannot accomplish a surplus reduction this year that will substantially solve the problem. We shall go well into 1937 before we can accomplish it. That is why I wish to keep the price-support program until the soil-bank plan can become wholly operative and effect a reduction in the surpluses.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is an interesting point—that the soil bank is the first new approach. I was interested a few weeks ago to pick up a copy of an agricultural publication which referred to the soil bank as a crisp, new approach to this problem. I have here a press release from the United States Department of Agriculture, Office of Information, press service, dated March 10, 1937, headed "Secretary Wallace Defines the 'Ever-Normal Granary.'"

I read:

The phrase "ever-normal granary" is defined by Secretary Wallace in an article in the March issue of the *Agricultural Situation*, published monthly by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

By the ever-normal granary, Secretary Wallace means "a definite system whereby supplies following years of drought or other great calamity would be large enough to take care of the consumer, but under which the farmer would not be unduly penalized in years of favorable weather."

Let me read the last paragraph:

"I call this part of the ever-normal granary program storing the grain in the soil," the Secretary explains, "instead of storing it in the bin." After the consumer is adequately taken care of by the building up of certain supplies, it is cheaper for the farmer, consumer, and Government alike to store additional quantities in the soil rather than in the bin.

So, if we want to find out how new it is, it is as new as 1937. The Senate and the House did not pay any attention to it then. Even though it is Henry Wallace's program, I still think it is a good program, and I think the Senate should adopt it.

Mr. THYE. If the Lord gives us rain at the proper time, and gives us the proper amount of sunlight, and if the farmer does not have to combat either drought or grasshoppers, we still, oftentimes, produce more than can be consumed domestically. Henry Wallace was right when he said that the only proper way was to build a fertile soil bank that could produce sufficiently if and when the need developed. Congress did not accept the proposal at that time. I hope it will now be accepted. It is too bad that a majority did not see fit to put that sort of program on the statute books in 1937. It is too bad that they did not do it then, but it is certainly going to be too bad if we do not do it now.

The only argument I have with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is this: Shall we reduce supports while these surpluses cause our markets to be so weak that the farmer cannot receive 80 percent of parity although the national economy is enjoying prosperity in its other segments?

I say that we should not do so with these surpluses hanging over our markets. It is for this reason that I have the courage—although I must say it is not pleasant, but embarrassing—to stand against some of my colleagues and against the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture.

But I disagree on the question of how to provide a better farm economy and bring it into balance at this time. I say that if the support price on wheat is to be reduced 27 cents a bushel this year and the support price on corn 18 cents a bushel this year, this will reflect on the prices of barley, oats, and the sorghums grown in the Southwest, as well as on the prices of other grains grown elsewhere in the Nation. If that should be the effect, the prices received by farmers will drop lower than they are today.

It is with this conviction that I speak as I do in favor of the 90-percent price supports, even though I may be criticized by some in my own State, who ask why I will not stand with my administration.

The Senator's proposal for flexible price supports, as is provided in the 1934 act, will further lower the income of farmers this year and they have already suffered severely. Therefore, until the soil bank program becomes effective, there will not be any stiffening of prices in the marketplace. That will not happen this year, and that is why I take the stand I do today.

I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for yielding to me.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad to have done so. I know how energetic and aggressive my friend, the senior Senator from Minnesota, is with respect to the farm problem. He understands the needs of the farmers.

At a dinner I was attending not long ago, a very amiable lady came up and asked me about the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young]. She said, "How do you get along with each other?"

I said, "Fine, fine. We get along very well."

She said, "How can you say that? You disagree with him on every issue."

I said, "No, no. We are not together on price supports; but we are absolutely together—just like that—and I put my two fingers together."

She said, "On what are you together?"

I replied, "On trying to do something for the American farmer. We simply consider the situation along different lines."

I am certain the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota is no more embarrassed in his opposition to his President and his opposition to his Secretary of Agriculture than I am in supporting their views. We both have our crosses to bear.

Mr. THYE. The fact of the matter is that I wish the Senator were not stand-

ing with them, because it makes it more difficult for me.

It is sometimes said to me, "I cannot understand your not being in step with your President or your Secretary of Agriculture. If the Senator from New Mexico, CLINT ANDERSON, himself a rancher and a former Secretary of Agriculture, sees it as the President and the Secretary of Agriculture see it, you must be wrong."

My reply is, "No, I am not wrong; I am sorry the Senator from New Mexico sees conditions that way."

The Senator from New Mexico and I are both caught on the horns of a dilemma.

Mr. ANDERSON. No doubt I regret the dereliction of the senior Senator from Minnesota as much as does the President. I can only say that I think agricultural matters should not be questions of partisan politics.

In 1947 we tried to find a basis upon which the problem might be solved. We did not succeed in doing so. I have felt many times that the matter had been plunged too deeply into politics in the 1948 election. I have regretted that it was a matter on which we divided along such strong political lines.

I would only say to the Senator from Minnesota that many of these matters are not new. The Senator from Minnesota speaks about the flexible price-support program in the 1954 act. Of course, there is nothing relating to flexible price supports in the 1954 act; it was in the act of 1948, which was sponsored by the Republican Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and it is in the Agricultural Act of 1949, sponsored by Democrats.

So these difficulties are not so easy to adjust on the basis of party loyalty.

I was deeply appreciative—I have said this before, and I am glad to do so again—when the Department of Agriculture, at the time I was the Secretary, presented the findings of a group of persons inside the Department and outside the Department as a permanent program of agricultural relief to the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who said he would introduce it in Congress. I thought that was a proper demonstration of nonpartisan administration.

As a result, when the President decides to stand by a program of flexible price supports, it ought not to seem very remarkable to anyone that I shall support that program, because I feel deeply about it. But in doing so, I am sure everyone understands that I shall not criticize my friends who may feel otherwise about the question, and who feel deeply about the agricultural situation in their own States.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator has pointed out that the price-support program was not an issue in the 1948 campaign, but that both major parties took the same position at that time. Agriculture generally did not become an issue until after the distinguished Senator from New Mexico left the office of Secretary of Agriculture, which I think was in May 1949.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; it was 1948. I was not in the Department of Agriculture when the subject became a red hot

political issue. When I was in the Department of Agriculture, I may say to my friend from Vermont, which was during the 80th Congress, I needed all the Republican support I could muster, day by day, on the matter of hog prices. The Senator from North Dakota can testify to that.

Mr. AIKEN. Although the question of grain storage got into the campaign of 1948, it was not until the spring of 1949 that the farm program really became a matter of politics in this country. From the spring of 1949 until the present time, agriculture has been involved politically. I still insist that the farm programs should not be partisan matters; that they, like our foreign relations and foreign policies, should be above partisanship; and that anyone who attempts to make farm programs partisan questions is performing no service at all for the farm population of the United States.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad to yield.
Mr. THYE. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for being so generous with his time in permitting Senators to have a little discussion of the bill.

I was in full support of the 1948 farm bill. I was with the committee when they conducted nationwide hearings in order to get opinions from the producers. Those hearings afforded the producers in various sections of the Nation a convenient opportunity to meet with the committee. Otherwise they would not have been able to present their views to the committee, because most of them could not actually have afforded to come to Washington.

I was in full support of the flexible provisions in the 1948 act. I did object to the omission of dairy provisions. However, a provision was included in the bill making it mandatory to support milk between 75 and 90 percent of parity, thus leaving the Secretary of Agriculture with some discretion in the establishment of price-support levels.

At that time—and this is the reason I wished to make a comment—an embargo was placed on the exportation of fats and oils, which were in short supply in the United States. Other commodities and products also were in short supply.

It was for that reason that flexibility was written into the act.

I do not say or agree that that was wholly correct; but I, who came from the Midwest, knew how surpluses could affect the farmers in that area, so I felt that the flexible price supports were proper, because they would bring about a diversion from the production of some crops to other crops, such as flax for linseed oil, and soy beans because of the shortage of oil. Therefore, I voted for flexibility in the program in order to permit shifting from a crop which was in long supply to a product that was in short supply. I never embraced the theory that a price reduction would compel reduced production, because I believed, as had others, that only through such a program as is now envisioned in the soil-bank program could we curtail production and ultimately manage the surpluses.

Any man who is familiar with the productive capacity of land knows that it is necessary to retire acres if production is to be reduced. No farmer, if he is a true farmer at heart, is going to neglect either his livestock or his crops. He will, with every effort, produce the maximum of which the land is capable. He will produce the maximum on his dairy farm, in his poultry houses, or on his pig lot. Therefore, the feed supply must be affected if there is to be a reduction in meat supply. Availability of feed grains will invariably encourage feeding of livestock or poultry, and result in an increase in dairy products. There can be no question about that.

It is for these reasons that I must stand here before the Senate and plead my case. If supports are dropped before the soil bank has become administratively operative, a reduction in farm income will result. Farm income has already slipped from \$17.2 billion in the late 1940's down to \$10.2 billion at this time. The farm income is threatening to go lower. Such a drop in income cannot be suffered by the farm segment of our economy without eventually endangering and adversely affecting industry, because the farmer is a big user of machinery, whether it be a combine, a tractor, a truck, a plow, or any of the other equipment necessary to the farmer's operations. If the farmer buys less from the local merchants, industrial plants will ultimately feel the result of the reduced purchases of the farmer. Finally, industrial plants will feel the pinch and men and women will be laid off and there will be unemployment.

That is why I am pleading my case today. There will be a chain reaction which will start in the grassroots and be reflected in the industrial centers.

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the Senator from Minnesota I am going to try to refer to several things to which I have already made reference. He is going to speak tomorrow—

Mr. THYE. I am very sorry I interrupted.

Mr. ANDERSON. No. I am very happy to have yielded to the Senator, and I have already so indicated.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an extract from the statement of Henry Wallace before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on March 7, 1935, a quotation from a radio address given by Henry A. Wallace over the National Farm and Home Hour on Tuesday, January 26, 1937, and a short quotation from Agricultural Price Policy, written by Geoffrey S. Shepherd, which again refers to those needs.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HENRY A. WALLACE BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY, UNITED STATES SENATE, MARCH 7, 1935, DURING THE COURSE OF HEARING ON S. 1807, A BILL TO AMEND THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES, PAGES 6-7

Coordination of commodity loans with production programs:

"Part of the amendments apply primarily to the production adjustment programs affecting the basic commodities. These would

coordinate commodity loans with production programs. . . .

"Coordinating commodity loans with production programs would be a step in the direction of the ever-normal granary plan which I suggested and have repeatedly advocated. The proposal provides for Government acquisition of commodities pledged by farmers as security for loans, and their repayment at the option of producers as benefit payments in kind. In my opinion, the inauguration of this method in the Smith cotton-option plan, sponsored by the chairman of your committee, worked out to the decided advantage of the farmers. Both our cotton and our corn loans have been very materially helpful to producers. This plan can be used to assure farmers the benefits of price improvements which otherwise would go to speculators; and also to build up and maintain reserve supplies of food, which can be handled through the benefit payment-in-kind method without depressing the farmers' markets. I believe this proposal is wholly sound and I hope it will be written into the Adjustment Act."

FROM RADIO ADDRESS GIVEN BY HENRY A. WALLACE OVER THE NATIONAL FARM AND HOME HOUR, JANUARY 26, 1937

"The ever-normal granary above and below the ground: Another way of approaching the problem of the ever-normal granary is through crop insurance, with premiums paid in grain and benefits paid in grain.

"No matter whether the ever-normal granary is established through governmental purchases, as in the case of the Farm Board, through commodity loans, or through crop insurance, there inevitably comes a time when favorable weather several years in succession results in large supplies—large supplies which bring unfairly low prices to the farmer and positive damage to the consumer from unemployment, which is a certain consequence of unfair prices to farmers. When more than a certain quantity of food is in storage the result is not abundance but waste.

"To prevent such consequences of years of favorable weather farmers must have the power to control their production. After adequate storage supplies of wheat, corn, and other grains have been established, it becomes the part of wisdom to conduct further storage operations in the soil rather than in the grain bin.

"We should, of course, divert a certain amount of corn and cotton acreage to soil-conserving crops because that will make for greater long-time productivity of our farm land. But for the most part, let's fill up the storage bins this year. It is good policy to vary the plans for storage of crops in the soil according to the state of supplies in the granary above ground."

FROM AGRICULTURAL PRICE POLICY, BY GEORGE S. SHEPHERD, 1947 EDITION, PAGE 40, WHICH CITED ABOVE STATEMENT FROM THE AGRICULTURAL SITUATION, BAE, USDA, VOLUME 20, NO. 1, JANUARY 1, 1936

A program of practical adjustment:

"To keep the Government from committing a farm board it will be necessary after supplies under the loan program have reached a certain point to keep the granary from running over by some practical program of production adjustment. I call this part of the ever-normal granary program 'storing the grain in the soil' instead of 'storing it in the bin.' After the consumer is adequately taken care of by the building up of certain supplies, it is cheaper for the farmer, consumer, and Government alike to store additional quantities in the soil rather than in the bin. If the weather is going to be unusually violent in its swings, it is nec-

essary for man to be unusually intelligent in meeting the problem. I believe the ever-normal granary is a start."

STATEMENTS BY SECRETARY WALLACE BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE HOLDING HEARINGS ON GENERAL FARM LEGISLATION, MAY 27, 1937, REFERRED TO THE EVER-NORMAL GRANARY BUT MADE NO SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO THE STORING OF RESERVES IN THE SOIL

"I am appearing before your committee today in support of the bill which is entitled 'The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1937.' I am strongly in favor of the principles and purposes of this bill. It is deserving of immediate consideration in Congress and I hope that legislation to carry out the aims of this measure will be enacted at the earliest possible date. The two fundamental purposes of this bill are first to safeguard the Nation's food supply and second to protect farm income. Under the terms of the bill, its aims would be attained through a system of loans to farmers to protect their prices and storage of reserve supplies against years of short crops, coupled with supplementary means to guard against accumulation of ruinous surpluses.

"The most vital parts of this bill are those calling for the establishment of an ever-normal granary in the great food crops of corn and wheat" (p. 135).

The necessity for stiff penalties for non-compliance was questioned by the chairman, and the Secretary replied (p. 143):

"The Farm Board experience, it seems to me, indicates that some penalty provision would be necessary. Suppose we had a few years of unusual production and the ever-normal granary was filled and overflowing, there would be a danger of finding ourselves in the same position the Farm Board was in where the Federal Treasury was not sufficient to protect the farmers and the Nation from the collapse which ensued."

The relation of the dairy industry to an ever-normal granary was stated by Secretary Wallace in response to a statement by Congressman Boileau (p. 153, same hearings):

"Let me suggest that we have been operating, in which I believe to be a practical way, the ever-normal granary for the dairy. If this bill were enacted the stabilizing of feed supplies of corn from year to year, would reduce the wide fluctuations in butter production, and the western cream production. There would be no sudden rush from hog farming into dairying such as took place during the early thirties. Moreover, we have diversion programs which enable us to purchase butter and cheese when the price is too low. We distribute this butter and cheese by the relief agencies in the various States.

"Now it seems to me that this is the practical way to perfect an ever-normal granary for dairying. It is not feasible to store dairy products for a great length of time."

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, to a degree an attempt was made to meet the recommendations of a soil bank by conservation payments. Our soil-conservation payments were a step in that direction. They constituted an effort to persuade the farmers to use the conservation policies which promised to bring production somewhat under control. But that did not supply the answer and the job could not be done.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I wish to comment on what the distinguished Senator had to say about the Committee on Agriculture

and Forestry. What he said is absolutely true. We see much in the press about the political angles involved in farm legislation. I have always thought that was an unjust accusation of the committee. Every member of the committee approaches the subject in a completely bipartisan manner, and everyone is just as sincere as he can be.

As the Senator knows, I supported the flexible program of 1948. If the economy of this country had returned to normal, as was expected, then the program would have worked out. I changed my views because I felt the farmers of my area could not exist under that program, when labor was making gains and agriculture was paying higher prices for the things it had to buy and was receiving lower prices for everything it has to sell. Every member of the committee certainly approaches the problem in a most sincere way.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator from North Dakota, and I agree with his opinion. That is why I should like to bring to the Senate's attention the next item. I refer to a speech in which the Secretary of Agriculture said that farm surpluses have been accumulating for years and that we had been accumulating them long before this administration came into office. I think it perhaps would be more correct to say that the circumstances which led to their accumulation had been developing over a long period of years.

I cited the case of rice, and I made the point that the Secretary of Agriculture could not control the carryover of 1,515,000 hundredweight of rice. Next year that amount increased by 6,031,000 hundredweight. Then it jumped up to 29,900,000 hundredweight of rice. There is no way in the world in which this rice situation can be shaken loose or rectified or brought under control. That is why I said we need to be very careful when we come to the rice question and not dismiss it lightly.

The Senator from Louisiana knows I am not in favor, generally, of a two-price system. I do not know how I am going to vote on the two-price system on rice, when I get to that, but I said many times in the committee that this is a situation which has arisen not primarily as a result of the fault of the rice farmer. Therefore, I think Congress must be very careful in making an appraisal of it. The rice carryovers which accumulated in all the years the Democrats were in office were only 9,822,000 hundredweight. So it would not be quite fair for us to blame it on another political party. Nor would it be quite fair to blame it all on the present Secretary, because there was in existence a law of Congress which provided that the rice acreage could not be reduced more than 15 percent the next year.

I am not saying it was an unwise piece of legislation. The country's rice growers would have been in for pretty rough treatment if that legislation had not been enacted. Therefore, all agricultural legislation has to be tempered a little bit in accordance with what the situation may be in respect to one par-

ticular commodity. Rice certainly is no exception to that rule.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator will recall that during the Korean war every effort was made by the Department of Agriculture to increase the production of rice. The Department did so because there was no rice production worth mentioning in South Korea and because the other countries which produced most of the rice for that area were unable to produce rice. Indochina, Burma, Thailand, and other countries could not fill the demand. The Senator remembers that.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Because of that situation the rice farmers of this Nation were asked to expand their production. The Senator recalls that in 1950 we had acreage controls on the production of rice. That year 1,632,000 acres were planted; a production of 38,689,000 hundredweight of rice was achieved.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. When the Korean war started, the rice acreage allotments established for 1951 were withdrawn, and they remained withdrawn until 1955. That is why we have such an accumulation of rice. It was thought by our planners that we should have a large amount of rice on hand in case it should be needed. The war ended, and the rice was not needed. We must not blame the farmers for that situation.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is exactly what I was trying to say to the Senator from Louisiana.

I hold in my hand the hearings on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. There were only seven pages of hearings, and those pages are not all full. In those seven pages the representative of the Department of Agriculture said it turned out we should have imposed acreage allotments on the 1954 crop. Of course, in the absence of such allotments the result was about a 17 percent increase in acreage in 1954, with unprecedented yields, so that we built up a tremendous supply.

The point I wish to make is that the problem is not one which can be easily solved. We will have to find a way to bring the situation under control. We will have to find ways of getting rid of the surpluses.

I hold in my hand a newspaper article under date of March 4, from Formosa, which reads, in part:

The Sino-American Joint Commission on Rural Reconstruction has made great strides in increasing agricultural production and improving farmers' livelihood in Formosa.

Then the article points out that the rice output in Formosa has gone up from 1,210,000 metric tons 5 years ago to 1,900,000 metric tons today. So by the stimulus of our own Government there has been built up in Formosa a situation that makes it impossible for us to get rid of our 29 million hundredweight of rice by any normal system.

That is why I say that sometimes I worry whether we have correctly considered the situation, whether first we

should worry about the level of prices, or whether first we should consider a program which we know will take care of the enormous surpluses; and then, having done that, see what we can do in the case of the individual commodities.

Cotton has a similar history. In 1952 we had a modest carryover of 5,600,000 bales. The first year Secretary Benson was in office, the figure increased to 9 million bales. If one were anxious to avoid telling the truth, he could say that Mr. Benson was responsible for that increase. But he was not. Actually, controls should have been imposed on the 1953 crop, but Congress did not provide for that. Therefore, the production increased to 9 million bales. Thereafter, it increased to 10 million bales, and then to 13,300,000 bales, or approximately that.

I say that at the first point, something should have been done about moving the surplus. The fact that that was not done is not necessarily the fault of the Secretary of Agriculture. I am not too familiar with negotiations between the State Department and the Department of Agriculture; but I should guess that every time the Secretary of Agriculture came forward with a program for getting rid of the surplus of cotton, he found himself in difficulties with the Secretary of State. I think we should provide that if the Secretary of Agriculture wishes to do something to get rid of the surplus, he shall have a chance to do so.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator from New Mexico has stated that acreage controls should have been imposed in 1953.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. But in 1953 we were still at war. Quotas would have to have been announced and voted on by the middle of December 1952, in order to become effective upon the 1953 crop. Controls were not imposed at that time, or later, because we were still at war in Korea.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thought the announcement was made some time in October, but it does not matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. The announcement is made by the middle of October and the referendum must be held by the middle of December of the preceding year.

Mr. ANDERSON. While it is true that we were still in some sort of semblance of war, in that particular year we actually increased our carryover by approximately 3 million bales.

Mr. ELLENDER. But the farmers were asked to produce in order to win the war. Our planners told them that "the lid is off"; farmers were asked to produce, and they did so.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not blaming the farmers at all. Neither am I critical of the Secretary of Agriculture in that connection any more than I am in the case of rice. I merely say that in such

a situation it is necessary to get rid of the surplus as quickly as possible.

In the case of wheat, in 1952 we had what was regarded as a normal carryover, namely, 256 million bushels. It can be said that 225 million or 210 million bushels is ideal. Certainly approximately that much is correct. But in 1953 the carryover was 562 million bushels; in 1954 the carryover was 902 million bushels; in 1955 the carryover was 1,021,000,000 bushels; and in 1956 the carryover is 1,043,000,000 bushels. I do not say it is wrong to have such amounts; but when the carryovers reach such proportions, something must be done to get rid of the surplus.

Mr. ELLENDER. But, again, surpluses were permitted to build up because of the war. The farmers were begged to increase their production, and they responded.

Mr. ANDERSON. Except that when there is so great a carryover, probably it is not necessary to make a special adjustment because of the war.

It also should be remembered that when we tried to bring wheat under controls, and when a restriction to 55 million acres was proposed, the House voted for 66 million acres, as I recall, and the Senate reduced the figure to approximately 61 million acres. Then the bill went to conference, and came out with a figure of approximately 62 million acres. I do not say there is anything very wrong about that; but having done it, every effort must be made to achieve elimination of the surplus stock and to eliminate it as rapidly as possible.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. In 1952 the carryover of wheat was approximately 252 million or 256 million bushels, which I agree is probably too large for the present time.

Mr. ANDERSON. No, that is about right.

Mr. CARLSON. However, in my opinion controls should have been imposed in 1952 on wheat as well as on cotton, as the Senator from New Mexico has said. But controls were not imposed then. Had they been imposed then, I do not think we would have gotten into the present situation, or at least we would not be so deeply involved as we are. Certainly we have no right to criticize the Secretary of Agriculture for that situation; I am in thorough accord with what the Senator from New Mexico has said on that score.

Mr. ANDERSON. Certainly we should bring this surplus situation under control now. If we do so, that will take care of some of the price problems we have. I am not too much worried about price; but I hope we will try to bring the surpluses under control and give the Secretary of Agriculture the authority he needs to do so.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am in thorough accord with the statement the Senator from New Mexico has made, namely, that the surplus problem is the one with which we must deal.

The Senator from New Mexico knows that we exported approximately 315 million bushels of wheat in 1952. But at the present time, and even with the very large subsidy, we have difficulty in disposing of approximately 200 million bushels.

Mr. ANDERSON. And that amount has been decreasing.

Mr. CARLSON. Then what shall we say of a State Department that refuses—and I used the word respectfully—to cooperate with us in disposing of some of the surpluses?

In the case of cotton, I do not know whether the State Department has approved the present plan. The last statement was that 5 million bales of cotton are to be exported. I do not know whether the State Department has approved that or not. If it does approve, perhaps that will be the breaking point so that we can start to move some of the surplus.

Mr. ANDERSON. A day or two ago I saw in the newspapers a statement in regard to the cotton situation. It said that India was greatly outraged because the United States was going to make certain exports of cotton.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me point out to the Senator from New Mexico that it was Egypt, not India.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, I stand corrected by my friend, the Senator from Louisiana. The newspaper account stated that Egypt was reassured about the United States cotton plan, and that Egypt's ambassador had a cordial chat with our State Department's representative, and came out of the meeting reassured.

I look at that account, on the one hand; and then I look at the figure of 5 million bales, on the other hand; and I say, "Who is kidding whom?" I know that the Secretary of Agriculture wants to move 5 million bales of cotton. I know when I was Secretary of Agriculture I tried to move 7 million bales of cotton, and I ran into the same buzzsaw. But the Secretary of Agriculture must insist, and I know he will insist, on moving 5 million bales of cotton. Unless we give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to move in this field, he cannot succeed in the way we know he must succeed.

For instance, Mr. President, does the State Department attempt to tell the Department of Labor whether it can or cannot approve a mediation in connection with the Westinghouse strike? I hope not. The Department of Labor is supposed to move in that field, and it does move in it. Mr. President, is it not the responsibility of the Secretary of Agriculture to represent the farmers of the United States to the same degree that it is the responsibility of the Department of Labor to represent the laboring groups?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield further to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I am in thorough accord with the statement of the Senator from New Mexico. For 2 years—not merely at the present time—the Secre-

tary of Agriculture has been trying to handle this problem and to solve it. It is time for us to be realistic about it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

I recognize that these agreements are necessary. But the question is, how can the problem be solved? The Secretary of Agriculture will have to battle if he is to be successful. Otherwise the farmers will never get a fair price schedule.

Mr. AIKEN rose.

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. We seem to have lost sight of what the historic United States export trade in cotton has been. We speak now of recovering our 5-million bale export market, as though that were the traditional amount of cotton exported. As a matter of fact, if we go back 22 or 23 years we find that in those years the United States was exporting about 10 million bales of cotton, not the 5 million bales which we talk of at this time. About that time, of course, a worldwide depression struck. The use of cotton dropped. Synthetics began to come into the picture; and we have dropped from an export, not of 5 million bales to 2 million bales this year, but from 10 million bales or more down to 2 million bales this year. If we do not do anything about it and continue to allow foreign countries to dictate the amount we export, in another 2 years we may not be exporting anything.

I think we have turned the tide. I do not believe we are going to hurt the other cotton-producing countries at all, because they, too, have been pricing cotton out of the market, when there are more than 2 billion people in the world today who probably would be using more cotton if they could get it at a more realistic world price than what they have had to pay. We have not only held a price umbrella over our own cotton producers, but we have encouraged producers in other countries to charge more for cotton than the market would bear.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Vermont is correct in that statement. By doing so we have also helped to build the synthetics industry. When the big argument was in progress at the conclusion of World War II as to whether or not the American surplus stocks of cotton would be moved into commerce or disposed of at home in some fashion, it was contended that if we moved the cotton into Japan, China, and other places, we would take away the market which traditionally belonged to other countries.

All we did was to preserve the cotton market for other countries against the inroads of synthetics. Had we accepted their dictation and refused to ship any cotton, we would have seen the expansion of synthetics in Japan very rapidly. But because cotton was moved into Japan and China, today there exists a cotton market which those countries would not otherwise have. If we were to move our cotton into that area now as rapidly as the demands of the world build up, I think we would be doing a favor to the cotton industry throughout the world, as well as helping ourselves.

Mr. AIKEN. As cotton is put on the market at competitive prices, not only the United States, but Egypt and other countries, will find their market for cotton expanded.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think so.

Mr. President, there are many things which I should like to discuss this afternoon at great length. I come back to the place where I started many months ago. Unless we can come forward with some sort of program for the disposition of surpluses rapidly, vigorously, and in an orderly fashion, so that the grain exchanges and cotton exchanges of the country will know that those commodities are not coming back to harass them, and will not be used to break world markets, we shall be in real trouble.

The American farmer has suffered enough from the accumulation of surpluses. I have tried to point that out in some instances—and probably in all—the surpluses have developed innocently. They have developed because we were in a war situation which seemed to make it wise. No war situation makes it wise now. Regardless of the explanation, I think this is the time to move and make disposition of these surpluses, if we expect any farm program to work.

There are Members of this body who firmly believe that one system of price supports is perfect and another system is not perfect. A great many people subscribe to a still different philosophy about price supports. That situation will continue so long as we have a Senate and a House and differing opinions. However, there is one thing upon which we can count. If we do not make complete disposition of the surpluses hanging over the market at this time, no system will produce any great degree of success so far as the American farmer is concerned.

I close where I started the other day. I compliment the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for taking his committee around the country. If that did anything for me, it was to prove that we were not agreed upon any particular route to salvation. One group of farmers believes one thing, and another group believes another.

Under those circumstances, it is very difficult indeed for the Senate to come to a final decision. I think we are all agreed that the surplus problem is very difficult. I think we all believe that some sort of soil bank needs to be established.

Personally I shall support the idea of a mandatory bank, because I believe it is the only useful tool which the Secretary of Agriculture can use so late in the season. If he goes to the American farmer now with a plan for a voluntary bank, he will get very little response, and the soil bank idea will receive very little support. I hope we may have a mandatory bank. I hope the Senate will agree to such a provision and let us take it to conference and see what the House conferees think about it.

I hope that in some manner, by suggestion of the Secretary or otherwise, we may then, or soon after, find a program for the disposition of surpluses which

the Congress can accept and support, and that the Secretary of Agriculture will then be able to carry it out.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is with some hesitation that I rise to speak on the farm program, coming as I do from an eastern State generally characterized as urban and industrial. I would speak on this subject, however—not only because Massachusetts has some of the Nation's finest farmlands, most modern methods, and most famous products—not only because farming is a vital Massachusetts industry, pumping more than \$200 million of cash farm income into our State's economy every year—but also because the agricultural policies of our Nation, while they may appear to affect more directly more farmers in other parts of the country, are of real significance to Massachusetts and her farmers, industries, consumers, and taxpayers; and, more importantly, because all of us in the Senate have a responsibility to the Nation as well as our own State and region.

My position on the pending amendment to eliminate rigid 90 percent price supports from the bill, in order to continue the new flexible program, is a position which I realize to be at variance with that held by the great majority of my fellow Democrats. I do not take pleasure from such disagreements—but I do regret that the long hours spent in debate over relatively minor differences in method have obscured the much larger and much more important area of agreement within our party—and, for the most part, within the entire Nation.

Both within our party and Nation, I think most of us would agree that agriculture needs some protection from the distress that results from violent downswings in farm prices. I think most of us want to prevent an agricultural depression that could wreck the Nation's economic health; and we want to prevent inequitable treatment of farmers at the hands of a Government discriminating in favor of other segments of the economy. I think most of us would agree that the national interest requires a long-range program adjusting production to demand, and enabling our farmers to move high-quality food and fibers at reasonable prices to consumers at home and abroad, without wasting our soil resources. And I think most of us would agree that the fixed price-support program provided a helpful cushion during the serious decline in farm prices and farm exports which has taken place in recent years, and during the general economic decline of 1954.

But, Mr. President, I am opposed at this time to any farm program calling for high price supports fixed at 90 percent of parity until such time as the flexible support program and the new soil-bank program have had a sufficient opportunity to prove themselves. To those of my colleagues who call upon me to support the 90-percent program, despite its shortcomings, as a means of stabilizing farm income during the current farm recession, I can only point to the decline in farm prices and income which has taken place during the opera-

tion of that 90-percent program, a decline which has been intensified by the ever-present threat posed by the huge surpluses acquired by the Government under that program. I am not an expert on farm economics. But it appears to me that—due at least in part to the stimulation of high support prices—the productive capacity of our food and fiber industry is overexpanded while its markets are shrinking—not so much in terms of actual and potential need, which will continue to increase here and in the poorer areas of the world, but in terms of distribution and purchasing power. Price supports at 90 percent of parity will not solve that problem; price supports at a lower or flexible level will not solve it either—but at least they will not accentuate it so badly. And though I am distressed by my colleagues' statistical data on falling farm income, I would remind them that like most subsidies, our farm programs have tended to help the well to do more than the poor. It has been estimated that less than 2 percent of the Nation's farmers receive more than 25 percent of the price-support program's benefits. Those who heavily weigh these statistics—the farm families at the bottom of the economic ladder, the Negro and Mexican tenant farmers of the South and Southwest, and others—will on the whole receive all too little of the benefits to be passed out under any support program.

But let me make clear, Mr. President, my belief that neither fixed nor sliding price supports offers a perfect, comprehensive, permanent answer to all the ills of agriculture. Neither program is free of the faults for which its own adherents condemn the other. The flexibility of the present compromise program is certainly very slight indeed, and it is doubtful that it will save the taxpayers any money. Both the old and the new programs depend upon the storage of surpluses too big to handle, too expensive to store. Both old and new offer support to some farmers in some parts of the country that hurts other farmers in other parts of the country. Both concentrate more on the farmer's price than on his net income, more on his guaranteed security than on his independence. Both programs require the farmer to accept various controls, particularly acreage restrictions which—being invariably followed by more intensive fertilization and production on the remaining acres—have in the past had little effect, except as a nuisance, in those instances. Neither program diminishes appreciably the production of surplus commodities or increases appreciably their markets, thus facilitating neither the end of the storage burden nor the adoption of sound soil conservation practices. Both subsidize the inefficient farmers while giving little help to those who most need it. Neither program enables our farmers to sell in the world market at normal competitive prices; and both require restrictions on agricultural imports—which would otherwise take advantage of our support program—thus restricting still further the market for farm exports. Neither of the present

alternatives offers substantially lower prices to consumers and industry.

In short, Mr. President, while I shall vote against 90 percent of parity, I do not deny its past benefits or reject its basic purpose; and while I shall support flexible parity, I do not look upon it as a final answer to the farm situation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I trust the Senator from Massachusetts will remain to listen to a few remarks I have to make that deal specifically with a portion of what he has just now said.

Mr. KENNEDY. I shall be delighted to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe that some of my remarks may have the effect of showing him that he has stated the problem in exactly the reverse order. If the soil-bank program is adopted, it will take more than a year to get it into operation. If, at the same time, as the Senator from Minnesota stated earlier this afternoon, we adopt flexible supports, we will drive many of the small farmers out of their farms and into the cities. We shall create a greater problem in the factory than we shall cure on the farm.

THE DISAPPEARANCE OF THE FAMILY FARM

One of the most amazing things to me about the farm situation is not generally known to the public. It is a fact which explains why for almost 30 years the farm problem has been an unsettled dilemma before Congress and in the executive branch of the Government.

There were fewer farms in the United States in 1955 than at any time since 1890. The Senator from Massachusetts was not born in 1890. At that time there were some 4 million farms in the United States. The exact number, obtained from the United States Census Bureau, was 4,564,641. That was in 1890.

In 1954 there were 4,782,933. There were 600,000 fewer farms in this country in 1954 than there were in 1950. The reduction of farms has become accelerated, and in the period from 1950 to 1954 there was the largest decrease of farms in the United States of any period of which the Bureau of the Census has any record.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Even though that may be true, in spite of the reduction in the number of farms, our productive capacity has steadily increased.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. The fact is that—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We have had a Department of Agriculture which has been researching and discovering ways and means of increasing production. We have better methods of production and better methods of planting, and we live in the machine age, with new reapers and new tractors, new milling machines, and the like, all of which do the work that was formerly done by laborers upon the farm. Of course, the land has been made more productive.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Are we not trying very hard to develop a program which

will ease the transference from agriculture of those who are living a marginal existence on farms?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; but the problem has not been solved. I am saying that the 90 percent of parity program is urged by the supporters of that program on the ground that without it we will create more disaster among the farmers. Let us wait until the soil-bank program can succeed, if it can, before we destroy the family size farm. That is my argument in just one sentence. This is a human problem as well as an economic one.

This afternoon, while the debate was going on, the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] a former very successful Secretary of Agriculture, was describing his point of view. During that time while listening to him I also read the bill—

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he leaves that point?

EXTRAORDINARY DELEGATION OF POWER

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be glad to yield very shortly. I should like to state first that I read exactly 18 pages of the bill during the debate this afternoon. I had read the bill before. However, the reading of it this afternoon was to determine how many times Congress had delegated to the Secretary of Agriculture its power to legislate—to fix rates, to determine goals, and, in short, to say how the program shall be carried on.

Much to my amazement, I found that in the 18 pages which I was able to read while the debate was going on, there were 21 instances in which Congress had delegated to the Secretary of Agriculture the power it ought to exercise itself.

I am very fearful that because of these weaknesses—amazing weaknesses, as the Senator, I am sure, will agree when I read some of them to him—the soil-bank program presented to us now is destined to fail.

It is a 4-year program, costing about \$750 million a year and affecting the whole country.

Let me read, first, one of the most startling provisions in the bill. I read from page 10, line 14:

Compensation under this section shall be at such rate or rates as the Secretary determines will provide producers with a fair and reasonable return for deducing their acreage of the commodity, taking into consideration the loss of production of the commodity on the reserve acreage, any savings in cost which result from not planting the commodity on the reserve acreage, and the incentive necessary to achieve the reserve acreage goal.

What are these powers? They are the powers of Congress. They are the power to fix rates, to determine what a fair and reasonable return shall be, to determine what the incentive shall be to induce farmers to keep their lands idle.

Here we turn over to the Secretary of Agriculture complete authority without any supervision on the part of Congress to provide the incentives which he deems

necessary to achieve the reserve-acreage goal.

Then the second part of this particular section reads thus:

(b) The total compensation paid producers for participating in the acreage-reserve program with respect to any year's crops shall not exceed \$750 million.

Thus, in just a few words in the bill, we hand over to the Secretary of Agriculture complete discretionary power to name the rate and rates and incentives necessary to promote the program, with only one limitation, namely, that he shall not spend more than \$750 million in a single year. Oh, yes; there is another limitation: he shall not pay more than \$100 an acre for retired tobacco land.

There was a time when Members of Congress believed that Congress was the source of the manner and authority of spending the public funds, but here we turn it over to the Secretary of Agriculture. There was a time when I used to hear this Chamber ring with the denunciation of bureaucracy, but in this bill we find a grant of bureaucratic power that exceeds anything I have ever read in all the bills we have ever passed from time to time delegating away the power of Congress.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before I advert to the matter as to which I have asked permission to intervene, I may say that the question just raised by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming is something which addressed itself with compelling force to each and every member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure it must have.

Mr. HOLLAND. There are 15 members of that committee, 8 from one party and 7 from the other party, coming from all parts of the Nation. We realized that if we could ourselves prescribe the exact price to be paid for the exact acreage, that would be preferable, but we found, for instance, when we came to a general program for the elimination of 12 million acres of one crop, the production of wheat, in 1 year, we were dealing with a commodity in which the ground was so different, the productivity so different in various parts of the Nation, that it was simply impossible to have 1 standard or 1 fixed measure apply to all. When it came to cotton, we could not apply the same standards to both the fertile reclaimed lands of the West which can produce as much as 3 bales to the acre or more, and marginal lands, if we wish to call them that, in the old cotton-producing part of the South, which produce only 250 to 275 pounds to the acre.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator from Florida permit me to make a remark now?

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will permit me to complete my statement, I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

It became completely evident that we would spend a whole summer in trying to work out details which would probably be unworkable in the end, because

of the immense variety of lands in crops throughout the Nation; then we would have no program at all. So the members of our committee, I think, without a dissenting voice, decided that the best thing the committee could do would be to state, as it is stated in the report, possible goals of the number of acres to be eliminated in the first year. We also imposed a maximum limitation on how much could be spent and we named factors which the Secretary must consider in establishing a program to accomplish a reduction in the acreage on each of the different classes of land which produce the same commodity.

If the Senator from Wyoming has a better program, speaking only as 1 member of a committee of 15, all I can say is that I shall welcome him and it with open arms and be glad to support its incorporation in the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Florida realizes that I have the floor, does he not?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do, and I apologize. If the Senator wishes to take the floor from me—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I merely wish to respond to what the Senator from Florida has said. I invite attention to page 17 of the bill. The Senator from Florida and every other Senator in this body, after this bill has been enacted into law, will have to go to the people of his State and say that by subsection (b) of section 208, the Senate has given to the Secretary of Agriculture the power to distribute the national acreage reserve goal among the States. The subsection to which I have referred reads as follows:

In distributing the national acreage goal among the various States and major crop-production regions, the Secretary shall give due regard to the respective needs of the various States—

Senators under this bill cannot do that—

and regions for flood control—

The regions are not specifically described. Sometimes these regions involve several States—

the respective needs of the various States and regions for flood control, drought control, and other conservation benefits; the desires of producers in particular States or regions to participate in the conservation program; the diversion of acreage from crops under acreage allotments or marketing quotas; and the need to assure adequate production of agricultural commodities and products not in surplus and to discourage the production of agricultural commodities and products in surplus.

I say to the very able Senator from Florida whose legal mind I have learned to respect from the time he first entered this body—

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

DO WE NEED TO GRANT THIS POWER?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This language, to my mind, grants to the Secretary of Agriculture almost the powers of a dictator over the farmlands of America. I really think that there are brains enough on the Committee on Agriculture and brains enough in the Senate of the

United States to draw a soil-bank proposal which will not place the Secretary of Agriculture and his experts, able though they may be, in complete control. No Member of this body, after this measure has been passed, can go back to his State and tell his people what land in that State will be set aside, because the Secretary will have to make the goals. There is an appeal in the bill to the Secretary that he fix the goals for 1956 at the earliest possible moment.

Now the Senator from Florida may proceed. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Wyoming, and I again extend that warm and unlimited welcome which I have tried to extend to any suggestion which the Senator may have—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am working on some suggestions.

Mr. HOLLAND. Which will clear up this whole matter and enable us to apply a standard which will be equally applicable to an area such as his own State, where the customary size of a farm may be in hundreds and thousands of acres, and, at the same time, apply to the Delta of Mississippi or the rich garden lands of New Jersey or to other lands equally rich.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The great areas of our farms in Wyoming are due to the fact that they are grazing lands, and much of the area is not in any way comparable to the rich soils of the delta on which large crops can be grown on small areas.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator makes my point more briefly and in better words than I have made it, that the farms of this Nation are so diversified that they offer us a challenge, indeed, to work out some formula that would be equally applicable to all.

Again I say, and I am sure I may speak for my distinguished friend, the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], in this matter, that our committee would welcome any suggestion which would spell out in figures and letters the specific program which the Secretary of Agriculture must use in every case.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, I do not think it is necessary to do that. The Senator is making the job too difficult. Not in every case.

Mr. HOLLAND. There was no unity in our committee on this subject. It was not the desire on the part of all the members of the committee to give the Secretary this heavy responsibility and this very great power to carry it out. But the more we studied the problem—and we have been studying it for over a year, and we studied it very assiduously, and I believe the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has been kind enough to compliment the chairman of the committee and the committee members for their visits which were made to many places throughout the Nation to try to get the thinking of our people—the more convinced we became that it was undesirable to attempt to include administrative details in the legislation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the committee has worked diligently on the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. But the committee has not yet brought up an answer to this question, and it is for that reason that I, speaking as one of the junior members of the committee, hope my able and beloved friend, from his great experience, will suggest a formula so simple and complete that we can incorporate it in this bill, and then not need to worry about passing on responsibility to the Secretary of Agriculture who is greatly admired by many Members, including myself, but who is not equally admired by every Member of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Despite the smile in the Senator's eyes, I assure him that I shall do my best to present amendments which will remove some of the defects which I find in the bill, one of which, by the way, is on page 15, beginning in line 2, and having to do with rates of compensation:

Such rate or rates may be determined on an individual farm basis, a county or area basis, or such other basis as the Secretary determines will facilitate the practical administration of the program.

THE SECRETARY'S POWER EXTENDS TO INDIVIDUAL FARMS

That language gives to the Secretary of Agriculture the power to run the entire gamut of agriculture in the United States, from the region, the State, the area, the county, down to the individual farm. In my recollection, no such power has ever before been granted by the Government of the United States to any official.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Florida. It is always interesting to debate with the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I certainly am comforted to know that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming intends to offer amendments which he thinks will meet the various questions which he has mentioned.

But to advert to the situation presented by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I had the honor to be one member of the committee to whose lot fell the pleasant duty of hearing, among other witnesses, witnesses from the great State of Massachusetts. We met, not in Massachusetts, but at Montpelier, Vt., where there were present, I should say, some 15 or 20 quite vocal, expressive witnesses from the State of Massachusetts. Perhaps there were more; the record will show.

I must say that, in my judgment, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts in setting forth his position stated the position—I believe it was unanimously; and if not that, then almost unanimously—stated for him by the witnesses from his State representing the various agricultural industries of Massachusetts.

I was comforted at the Montpelier meeting, after hearing not only the witnesses from Massachusetts, but also witnesses from all the States of New England, to discover that there are large segments of our agricultural industry, including those from that particular sec-

tion of the Nation, who still believe that the law of supply and demand has some potentiality, and who still think that any agricultural program which must be evolved should be evolved against a sound dovetailing with the law of supply and demand.

I was comforted to find in that area, and in others where the insidious results of the operation of the high price-support formulas has not affected the thinking of the farm people, that there came forth expressions which I thought were sound and showed a continuance of the soundness and conservatism which we have always expected from our agricultural people, which has been traditional up to this time, but which has vanished, I am sorry to say, in some areas of the Nation.

I shall address myself at greater length to that point of view, which I regret to have discovered, in the course of the hearings, as having made itself so clearly seen in some other industries, some other commodities, and some other areas of our Nation. But certainly in old New England there is still the individuality, the independence, and the willingness to plan for oneself and for one's industry; the willingness to measure one's productive capacity against the active needs of the people who use the product, which is what we expect of agriculture.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts—and I compliment him upon setting forth the contentions of his own agricultural people in stating his position upon this particular amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY. On behalf of the agricultural people of Massachusetts, I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for his kind statement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I compliment the individualist farmers of New England, and especially of Massachusetts, but I should like the Senator to glance at the section of the bill I have just read into the RECORD and tell the individualistic agriculturalists of Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, Maine, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, that under the soil bank proposal the Secretary may determine the rates upon the basis of even individual farms; so that the rate paid to Farmer Jones and the rate paid to Farmer Smith, his neighbor, may be different. I do not say that they will be; but the power will be granted by the bill, and it will apply to the farmers of New England just as it will apply to the farmers of Wyoming, and those of the other Rocky Mountain States, those of Oklahoma, Louisiana, and all the other States of the Union.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me say to my good friend from Wyoming that the power which the committee bill would give to the Secretary of Agriculture is, in my opinion, necessary.

THIS IS A SURRENDER TO BUREAUCRACY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no doubt about that. What I am trying to point out is that if we have come to such a pass in this country that the Senate thinks

necessity compels the setting up of a public czar of agriculture, we had better stop talking about bureaucracies in political campaigns.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator well knows that this country is vast in area and that different kinds of crops are grown in every part of the Nation. Whereas the size of a small farm in Wyoming might be 3,200 acres, in Louisiana it would be less than 80 acres.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There are many farms in Wyoming which are as small as 80 acres, 120 acres, or 160 acres.

The Senator need not worry. There are small farms which will grow agricultural crops, and many of the small farmers and small cattle ranchers are today fearful that they will be driven out of agriculture completely unless the Senator's provision for 90 percent of parity is included in the bill. I am behind the Senator on that point.

I am simply trying to make the record clear, so that the country as well as the Senate may know that the extent of the discretionary power over legislative matters which we are proposing to grant in the bill. No wonder there are empty seats in the Chamber. We are passing our powers away.

Mr. ELLENDER. This discretionary provision sets no precedent. It is nothing new.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, it is nothing new; but where will it end?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know, but the committee had no alternative. We set no precedent, however. Let me call the Senator's attention to the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act of 1936. Congress granted full discretion to the Secretary of Agriculture in that act to apportion among the States the conservation funds which Congress might appropriate. I read section 7 (g), as follows:

On or before November 1 of each year the Secretary shall apportion among the several States the funds which will be available for carrying out State plans during the next calendar year, and in determining the amount to be apportioned to each State, the Secretary shall take into consideration the acreage and value of the major soil depleting and major export crops produced in the respective States during a representative period and the acreage and productivity of land devoted to agricultural production (including dairy products) in the respective States during a representative period: *Provided, however,* That any such apportionment or funds available for carrying out State plans during any year prior to 1942 may be made at any time prior to or during the year to which such plans relate. Notwithstanding the making of an apportionment to any State for any calendar year, the funds apportioned to any State for which no plan has been approved for such year, and any amount apportioned to any State which is not required to carry out an approved plan for such State for such year, shall be available for carrying out the provisions of sections 7 to 14, inclusive, of this act.

That act gave the Secretary of Agriculture almost complete administrative power. I am free to confess to my good friend from Wyoming that the pending bill does give the Secretary wide power with respect to the soil bank and other programs, but I wish the Senator would

tell us how it would be possible for us to write into the law a yardstick, a standard, which would be applicable to every farm, every county, and every area in our country, and still carry out the act as it should be carried out.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think it would be utterly impossible to devise one formula which would be applicable to every area, just as in the bill the Senator's committee has found it impossible to deal with all the commodities alike. There is a different program for rice from that which has been provided for wheat. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is a 2-price program for rice, on a trial basis.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But it is in the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is true. The Senator from Kansas is going to submit an amendment for a 2-price system for wheat.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I cannot read the minds of the various Senators who intend to offer amendments. I am talking about the bill as I see it. I am glad the Senator is going to offer such an amendment. It only bears out the contention I made, that amendments are needed.

Mr. ELLENDER. There are 63 amendments pending. Some of them undoubtedly will be adopted.

TWENTY-ONE GRANTS OF DISCRETIONARY POWER

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to have the opportunity to present the entire list of these discretionary powers which are granted to the Secretary in the bill. In order that they may appear in the RECORD in consecutive order, where those who wish to read the RECORD may find them, I hope that I may be able to give them 1 by 1 without interruption. After I have read them into the RECORD I shall, of course, be happy to answer any questions that may be addressed to me.

The first I have marked down appears on page 3 of the bill, section 203, which reads:

Whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported under this act, the price of the other shall be supported at such level as the Secretary determines will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market.

That is, subject to the determination of the Secretary.

Mr. ELLENDER. May I state to the Senator that the Secretary does that now?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator please withhold his comments? I shall later come back to the items, and we may go over them one by one.

Mr. ELLENDER. Very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Number 2 appears on page 7 of the bill:

To be eligible for such compensation—

That is, the soil bank compensation, and I am reading from page 7, beginning on line 15—

To be eligible for such compensation the producer (a) shall reduce his acreage of the commodity below his farm acreage allotment within such limits as the Secretary may prescribe, (b) shall specifically designate the acreage so withdrawn from the production of such commodity * * * and (c)—

And here comes discretionary delegation No. 3—

shall not harvest any crop from, or graze, the reserve acreage unless the Secretary, after certification by the governor of the State in which such acreage is situated of the need for grazing on such acreage, determines—

That is, the Secretary—

that it is necessary to permit grazing thereon in order to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster, and consents to such grazing.

The Secretary of Agriculture and he alone may decide when damage or hardship may be relieved. How simple it would have been, Mr. President, to have written into that paragraph that, in the case of severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster, the Secretary shall consent. But instead of that, the Secretary, and he alone, is the person who must grant the consent.

When we delegate these powers, Mr. President, we must remember that the Secretary is only human. He has only 24 hours in the day, as all the rest of us have, and most of the work he does must be delegated to someone else. So nobody knows who actually will carry on this discretionary power.

Now we come to No. 4 on the list of delegations of legislative power, on page 8, beginning on line 6:

In the formulation and administration of the acreage-reserve program the Secretary shall provide adequate safeguards to protect the interests of tenants and sharecroppers—

That is a wholly laudable objective, but it is the Secretary who is to protect the sharecroppers and tenants in the manner that pleases him—not the Congress. This protection, on line 11, reads—

and including such provision as may be necessary to prevent them from being forced off the farm.

What sort of a program is this? How can it be enforced? Who is going to make the determination whether the tenant or the sharecropper will be forced off the farm? The Secretary. What are the factors that go into the shaping of his decision? They do not appear here.

Now we come to No. 5 on our list; on the same page 8, beginning in line 13:

The acreage reserve program may include such terms and conditions, in addition to those specifically provided for herein, including provisions relating to control of noxious weeds on the reserve acreage, as the Secretary determines are desirable to effectuate the purposes of this act.

Nobody but the Secretary can determine whether the elimination of noxious weeds shall be desirable and sufficient to "facilitate the practical administration of the acreage reserve program."

Here is No. 6, section 204:

SEC. 204. For purposes of the acreage reserve program the Secretary shall establish a national reserve acreage goal for the 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959 crops of wheat, cotton, corn, rice, flue-cured tobacco, burley tobacco, and cigar binder tobacco types 51, 52, 54, and 55, respectively.

Who establishes the goal? The Congress? No. The Secretary. Who says

how many acres in the United States shall be set aside in the soil bank? The House? No. The Senate? No. The Agriculture Committee of the Senate? No. The Agriculture Committee of the House? No. The Secretary. He gives the word. His is the power.

Who tells the farmers of the land what the goal shall be? The Secretary, and he alone.

This is No. 7, on page 9, beginning on line 1:

The limits within which individual farms may participate in the acreage reserve program shall be established in such manner as the Secretary determines is reasonably calculated to achieve the national reserve acreage goal and give producers a fair and equitable opportunity to participate in the acreage reserve program.

Let me repeat:

The limits within which individual farms may participate in the acreage reserve program shall be established in such manner as the Secretary determines.

Mr. President, did the constitutional fathers ever in their dreams imagine that the time could come when a Congress of the United States would be asked to give away to a Cabinet officer such great control over the farmlands of the United States? They sought to establish a government of the people, by representatives of the people, and not a bureaucratic dictatorship which would extend to the determination of all the details of an agricultural program affecting individual farms throughout the land.

Here is the eighth instance of legislative delegation:

COMPENSATION OF PRODUCERS

SEC. 205. (a) Producers shall be compensated for participating in the acreage reserve program for any commodity through the issuance of negotiable certificates which the Commodity Credit Corporation shall redeem in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary—

Does the Congress provide the regulations? No. Of course, I realize that for 30 years or more Congress, in the progress of the delegation of its powers, has been setting up boards and commissions, and has been giving them power to write rules and regulations. But heretofore the Congress has endeavored to set up standards which would control the exercise of the discretion of the Executive or of the board or of the Commission. However, we search this bill in vain to find standards to guide the discretion of the Secretary. Instead, he is given the power—almost in words of one syllable—to do what? Here is the ninth instance. I have previously read this provision; but in order to have it fall in its consecutive place, I read it again:

Compensation under this section shall be at such rate or rates as the Secretary determines will provide producers with a fair and reasonable return for reducing their acreage of the commodity, taking into consideration the loss of production of the commodity on the reserve acreage, any savings in cost which result from not planting the commodity on the reserve acreage, and the incentive necessary to achieve the reserve acreage goal.

THE SECRETARY AND THE INCENTIVES

Mr. President, what does the word "incentive" mean, as used in that provision? It means, it seems to me, that if \$1 does not suffice, the Secretary should try \$2; and if \$2 does not suffice, he should try \$5; or perhaps he should fall into the practice which we see on the television, these days—in which case we shall have a \$64,000 program or a \$100,000 program, and the Secretary shall see which will be the best in order to provide the necessary incentive.

Mr. President, does that seem to be a wild suggestion on my part? If any Senator or any other reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD thinks so, then I ask him to turn to page 15 of the bill and read subsection (c) of section 207:

(c) In determining the lands in any area to be covered by contracts entered into under this section, the Secretary may use advertising and bid procedure if he determines that such action will contribute to the effective and equitable administration of the conservation reserve program.

We set up a huge fund—amounting to millions of dollars—for the payment of benefits. We allow the Secretary to fix the rates; and then we allow him—in order that he may provide a proper incentive to induce farmers to set aside their lands, to place them in the soil bank—to resort to advertising and bidding, which means "bid it up, bid it up, bid it up."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield at this point?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. ELLENDER. The reason for that provision is—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I admit it needs explanation.

Mr. ELLENDER. It was a proposal submitted by the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HICKENLOOPER), and we heard a special witness in that regard. The object of the provision is to get the farmers to bid their acres in; and the one who bids the least money to bring about the desired amount of reduced production will be permitted to participate in the conservation reserve. It is not a question of the farmer getting more money. Instead, it is a question of the Government getting the reduction with the least amount of cost.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then let us amend this section so as to make sure that the advertising and bid feature is for the purpose of getting more acres set aside, and not for the purpose of having more money paid. Such an amendment would be an excellent one to this provision of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Perhaps the Senator from Wyoming will prepare the amendment. What I have stated is the purpose of the present provision.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I accept the Senator's explanation. I say such an amendment should be written into the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Furthermore, the Senator from Wyoming should bear in mind that the program is entirely voluntary; there is no compulsion of any sort or in any manner.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I realize that. But it is designed to get land out of production, and is designed to authorize the Secretary to provide the incentives.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Now I come to the 10th instance; it appears on pages 11 and 12:

SUBTITLE B—CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM TERMS AND CONDITIONS

SEC. 207. (a) To effectuate the purposes of this act the Secretary is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for periods of not less than 3 years with producers determined by him to have control for the contract period of the farms covered by the contract wherein the producer shall agree—

Here is a determination to be made by the Secretary, under the authorization of the bill, by which he may select by his own decision the farmers whom he deems to have control of the land to be covered in the contracts.

Now we go to the 10th instance, which appears on page 13; it is subparagraph (5), of section 207 (a)—one of the provisions regarding what shall be written into the contract. I read:

The producer shall agree:

(5) Not to adopt any practice, or divert lands on the farm from conservation, woods, pasture, or other use to any use, specified by the Secretary in the contract as a practice or use which would tend to defeat the purposes of the contract.

Any practice specified by the Secretary. Can delegation of power of Congress go further?

This is the 12th instance; and, again, this is to be a part of the producer's contract:

(6) To forfeit all rights to further payments or grants under the contract and refund to the United States all payments or grants received thereunder upon his violation of the contract at any stage during the time he has control of the farm if the Secretary determines that such violation is of such nature as to warrant termination of the contract, or to make such refunds or accept such payment adjustments, or forfeit such price-support benefits, as the Secretary may deem appropriate if he determines that the producer's violation does not warrant termination of the contract.

Then we come to instance No. 13, on page 13, beginning in line 20 with subparagraph (7):

(7) To such additional provisions as the Secretary determines are desirable and includes in the contract to effectuate the purposes of this act and to facilitate the practical administration of the conservation-reserve program, including provisions relating to control of noxious weeds.

In other words, here we have the power granted to the Secretary of Agriculture to determine what additional provisions, not mentioned in the bill, must go into the contract which the producer must sign.

No. 14, beginning in line 3 on page 14, subparagraph (1) of subsection (b) of

the same section, addressed to the obligations of the Secretary, reads as follows:

(b) In return for such agreement by the producer the Secretary shall agree:

(1) To bear such part of the cost (including labor) of establishing and maintaining vegetative cover or water storage facilities, or other soil, water, wildlife, or forest conserving uses, on the designated acreage as the Secretary determines to be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act, but not to exceed a maximum amount per acre or facility prescribed by the Secretary for the county or area in which the farm is situated;

Additional power and discretion are conferred upon the Secretary. Congress passes. The Secretary decides.

Instance No. 15 is subparagraph (2) of the same subsection. Again it refers to the rates. Beginning in line 14 on page 14:

The rate or rates of the annual payment to be provided for in the contracts shall be established on such basis as the Secretary determines will provide producers with a fair and reasonable annual return.

Surely there is nothing more important than fixing the rates, nothing more clearly a function of Congress, but we toss it away to the Secretary. Are we not deliberately breaking down the constitutional separation of powers?

The Secretary determines not only what the rate or rates shall be, but he determines what the fair and reasonable return on the land established in protective vegetative cover or water storage facilities shall be.

Instance No. 16, beginning in line 2, on page 15:

Such rate or rates may be determined on an individual farm basis, a county or area basis, or such other basis as the Secretary determines will facilitate the practical administration of the program.

Under this provision the Secretary may go from the smallest family-sized farm to the largest ranch and deal with them all on an individual basis.

Instance No. 17 in this continuous surrender of legislative duty is found beginning in line 6 on page 15:

(c) In determining the lands in any area to be covered by contracts entered into under this section, the Secretary may use advertising and bid procedure if he determines that such action will contribute to the effective and equitable administration of the conservation reserve program.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has already indicated that that provision may be considered for amendment.

Instance No. 18 is found on page 15, beginning in line 14:

Whenever the Secretary has reason to believe that there has been a violation which would warrant termination of a contract he shall give the producer written notice thereof and the producer shall, if he requests such an opportunity within 30 days after mailing or serving of such notice, be given an opportunity to show cause, in a formal or informal proceeding under regulations promulgated by the Secretary, why the contract should not be terminated. If the Secretary determines that the contract shall be terminated the producer shall be given written notice of such determination. If the pro-

ducer feels aggrieved by such determination, he may within 90 days after the mailing or service of such notice appeal to the United States district court, for the district in which the land covered by the contract is located, for a determination of the facts in the case and judicial relief with respect thereto. If the producer does not request an opportunity to show cause why the contract should not be terminated, within such 30-day period, or appeal from the Secretary's determination within such 90-day period, the Secretary's determination shall be final and conclusive.

I should like to have the opinion of any lawyer in the Department of Agriculture as to the ability of any producer to get into court with a justiciable issue, considering all the discretionary power proposed to be granted to the Secretary by this bill.

Instance No. 19 is section 208 (a). It deals with the establishment of a national conservation reserve goal:

CONSERVATION RESERVE GOAL

SEC. 208. (a) The Secretary shall not later than February 1 of each year determine and announce the national conservation reserve goal for such year. Such goal shall be that percentage which the Secretary determines it is practicable to cover by contracts during such year of the number of acres, if any, by which (1) the acreage used for the production of agricultural commodities during the year preceding the year for which such determination is made, plus any acreage then in the acreage or conservation reserve program or retired from production as a result of acreage allotments or marketing quotas, exceeds (2) the acreage needed during the year for which such determination is made for the production of agricultural commodities for domestic consumption and export and an adequate allowance for carry-over. As soon as practicable after the enactment of this act the Secretary shall determine the national conservation acreage goal for 1956.

THE GIGANTIC TASK OF REGIMENTING THE FARMERS

I do not wonder that the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] said that the committee found the task of regimenting the farmers of America so great that it was unable to devise any formula with which to do it, and so it sought to establish a czar.

Why should not Congress determine what the goal should be each year, and save the Secretary and his staff all these decisions? It is within the power of Congress to do it.

The next instance, No. 20, is found on page 17, beginning in line 3. It is subsection (b) of section 208. It reads as follows:

(b) In distributing the national acreage goal among the various States and major crop production regions, the Secretary shall give due regard to the respective needs of the various States and regions for flood control, drought control, and other conservation benefits; the desires of producers in particular States or regions to participate in the conservation program; the diversion of acreage from crops under acreage allotments or marketing quotas; and the need to assure adequate production of agricultural commodities and products not in surplus and to discourage the production of agricultural commodities and products in surplus.

I stated that I had begun reading the bill while listening to the speech of the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr.

ANDERSON], and that, having covered 18 pages, I had found 20 or more instances of the delegation of legislative power to the Executive.

I believe this to be the most expansive grant of discretionary authority to legislate for the people of America that has ever been given to any Executive in this country. Oh, I know that during the depression, after the McNary-Haugen Act had been repeatedly vetoed, and the prices of farm commodities had sunk to an all-time low, when farmers were gathered in many courthouses to protest the foreclosure of mortgages, and sometimes threatened to haul the judge from the bench—

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. What the distinguished Senator from Wyoming speaks of in connection with the terrible hardship years the farmers experienced is what has caused me to pay as much attention to farm legislation as I have. During the early thirties I appraised many farms for the Federal land bank. At that time Congress enacted what was known as the Commissioner's loan. It was enacted for the purpose of creating a fund to be used for second mortgages. It was realized that land-bank loans must be conservative, because the laws regarding them were so intended. Consequently, there was not sufficient lending ability available to the Federal land banks to make all necessary loans. Therefore, Congress enacted the Commissioner's loan, to create a fund for use as second mortgages to the land-bank loan.

That saved the farmer. I am fully acquainted with that situation as I worked directly under it. In the winter of 1934, in order to keep ahead of the sheriffs' sales, I appraised lands in the Midwest, when the ground was not only frozen, but oftentimes covered with several inches to a foot or more of snow.

We could determine the value of land only by knowing the area or by judging the quality of the grain and hay grown on it.

Normally, we did not appraise in the dead of winter in a northern region. Appraisers want to see the condition of the ground and determine the depth of the top soil. However, we had to do it in the winter in order to keep ahead of the sheriff's sales.

I shall never forget that experience. Therefore, I shall never be a party, in Congress or in private life, to a program which will bring about a return to such disastrous economic conditions in the farm areas of the Nation.

Because of my experiences, I am compelled to stand here today and urge continuance of the 90-percent program until such time as the soil-bank program can operate and take some of our acreage out of cropping, and thus effect a reduction in the overall surpluses we are confronted with today.

I wish to commend the Senator from Wyoming for referring to a time in the history of our Nation of which all of us should be constantly reminded. We must

be mindful of the fact that we may some day return to those terrible conditions if we are not careful.

THE CYNICS AND THE SMALL FARM

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Minnesota has stated his experience in that connection.

I was in Wyoming in those days. I had occasion to travel through the State of Iowa and I remember occasions in that State when, because of the low price of milk, milk trucks delivering milk to the cities were being overturned by the farmers because the Government had not done anything to aid the depreciation of farm prices.

We are facing the same situation today. However, we are facing it when there are cynics in the land who say without hesitation that the time has gone for the family-sized farm and that agriculture is big business and that we must let the farmer and his wife and his children give up the hope of settling upon a farm.

The other day I called up the Bureau of Reclamation to find out if there were still applications being made for reclamation farms. There are. The popularity of farms of limited acreage—80 acres, 100 acres, or 120 acres—is indicated by the fact that since 1946 there have been 49 land openings in the reclamation States.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me first state the facts. There were 49 land openings. Two thousand one hundred and sixty-seven farm units were available for distribution. Only 2,167, Mr. President. In recent days several hundred veterans have applied for admission to small farms.

It is only a few years ago since the close of the war that I stood in a motion picture theater in the city of Powell, Wyo., when the Heart Mountain project was opened. There were so few small units for the many veterans who had applied that the names of the applicants were written upon small tablets and poured into a huge glass bowl, 3 feet in depth and 18 inches in diameter, or approximately that. That bowl was turned by hand. Then the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Deputy Commissioner and the Governor of the State and the Senator from the State—which was I—had the opportunity of drawing those names.

The Commissioner of Reclamation drew five names. The Deputy Commissioner drew five names. That was 10 so far. The Governor of the State then drew 3. That was 13. Not a single name of a citizen of Wyoming had been drawn up to that moment. Then I was called upon to draw, and I am happy to report that I had the good luck to draw two Wyoming names.

Mr. ELLENDER. Out of three?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Out of three. What I wish to point out is that the veterans of the country still believe in the agricultural way of life. However, business leaders do not believe that way.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I wish to join in the comment that the veterans of America still desire farms and oftentimes do go into farming. The only reason I wish to comment at this point is to call attention to the fact that when some people speak of a farm that is too small to be efficient, it is an idle statement and frequently an inaccurate one.

I have seen most efficient farmers operating on 80-acre farms in southern Minnesota. I have seen many times farmers on 80-acre farms prove to be highly efficient farmers, with an excellent net return in a year. I have seen such a farmer able to provide for his children just as well as a larger operator.

It is utterly impossible to measure what is a profitable and efficient farm, and many times all the theories which may be applied in trying to determine what is a profitable and efficient farm go out the window.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does not the Senator agree that that question is bound inevitably to enter into the determinations and decisions of those who will be in charge of writing the rules and regulations and in carrying out the soil bank provision?

Mr. THYE. That is correct. Time after time I have seen a small family unit of 80 or even 40 acres, lying among other farms of 3 or 4 times that size, become the most efficient and most profitable farm in returns to the operator. It is a way of life for the family. The children attend school, aiding and assisting with the chores mornings and evenings, and they are at home during the summer recess and do some of the field work. When I hear it said that the family farm is an inefficient unit and it has to be supplemented, it is almost laughable when practical experience is applied.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me read to the Senator from an editorial published in the Journal of Commerce.

Mr. J. Roger Wallace was speaking on Tuesday, February 21, at a luncheon meeting of the Commodity Club of New York. The speech was entitled "What Is Wrong With Our Agricultural Policy?" Let me read just a few extracts from it:

If agriculture were permitted to become truly efficient, there would be no place at all in agriculture for the hundreds of thousands of small, inefficient farmers who at best can make no more than a miserable living from the soil.

The political angle is disguised under the slogans of "agriculture as a way of life" and "perpetuating the family farm." Actually, what is being perpetuated in many instances is no more than farm slums.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if in this country we ever reach the time when there are nothing but large farm units and farm-management operations, we will have not only organized farm workers, but we will have what has been experienced in the pineapple farm operations in the Hawaiian Islands, where lands are owned by corporations and the farms operated by the owners of sugar-mill companies. In order that the workers could eke out a bare existence, they were compelled, oftentimes, to go on

strike to force wages up. If the corporation-type farm ever becomes the basis of agriculture in this Nation, that which our forefathers willed us will be lost to future generations. There will not be families residing on small independent farm units across the Nation. There will be great estates, with overseers, and with small houses for the field workers to return to at night. There will be neither opportunity nor a sense of ownership or initiative given to the individual who loves the soil and wants to farm.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And those who buy the farms will offset their farm losses against the huge profits they make in industry.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator pardon me just a moment?

Mr. President, instead of reading the entire statement, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text as printed in the New York Journal of Commerce of Thursday, February 23, 1956, be made a part of my speech at this point.

I think I made a mistake and referred to Mr. Wallace as Mr. Rogers. The name is J. Roger Wallace. In order to make it clear that he is not the Henry Wallace who once was Secretary of Agriculture, who did work for the small farmer and who did originate the theory of the soil bank, I wish to call attention to the fact that this Wallace is J. Roger Wallace.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT BLAMED FOR CHAOTIC AGRICULTURAL SITUATION

Incorrect diagnosis by the Federal Government of the true nature of the farm problem is primarily responsible for the present chaotic agricultural situation. In the mistaken belief that artificial elevation of prices is the solution, the Government has accumulated billions of dollars worth of farm products that cannot be liquidated except at tremendous loss.

As a result of this misguided emphasis on prices, the American consumer has been forced to pay more for practically everything he buys, both farm products and non-farm products.

RELIEF PROVES COSTLY

During the past two decades, some \$20 billion of taxpayers' money have gone down the drain of farm "relief." A huge bureaucracy has been created to administer the various phases of a succession of bungling farm programs.

As surpluses have accounted, owing to the willful destruction of both domestic and export markets, restrictions have been imposed on production of certain crops only to turn farmers to other crops and resultant new surpluses.

There is no evading the fact that the Government farm program, as presently conceived, is a complete failure. It was obvious some 25 years ago, when Washington first undertook to elevate farm products prices, that such attempts to nullify the law of supply and demand could only result in failure and a chaotic agricultural situation.

PATCHWORK CONTINUING

However Congress still is attempting to patch up the farm program wreck rather than junk it. But, nothing can save American agriculture from further chaos except

abandonment of price controls and restoration of free markets. Even though it may not be possible to do this in one fell swoop, we can make a start, with a definite time goal for the termination of all price supports.

During the early days of the industrial revolution in England, the displaced workers mobbed the factories and smashed the machines, trying to turn the clock back. In essence, that is what the Government has been trying to do to the agricultural revolution.

This is implicit in the parity price concept, deliberately set up to ignore the sharp increases in agricultural productivity and improved methods of agricultural production that should be benefitting consumers as well as farmers.

RIDES BOTH MULE, TRACTOR

The Government, with its misguided and bungling farm policies, is trying at one and the same time to ride both the mule and the tractor, with each moving in opposite directions. Through the application of machinery and scientific methods, agricultural productivity per man-hour has doubled since prewar and still is rising rapidly.

On highly mechanized farms, the gains in productivity have been much greater.

Washington, not content with acreage restrictions that stifle efficiency and put premiums on inefficiency, now is talking of putting chains on productivity through rigid production quotas. This, of course, would be a deliberate step backward.

One does not have to be particularly cynical to conclude that the primary objective of governmental agricultural policy is political rather than economic or social. If agriculture were permitted to become truly efficient, there would be no place at all in agriculture for the hundreds of thousands of small, inefficient farmers who at best can make no more than a miserable living from the soil.

Although they produce little, they count heavily in the election returns.

DISGUISED UNDER SLOGANS

The political angle is disguised under the slogans of "agriculture as a way of life" and "perpetuating the family farm." Actually, what is being perpetuated in many instances is no more than farm slums. If these people were to pick up and leave for more gainful occupations, many politicians would have no constituents left to vote for them.

There are approximately 5 million farms in the United States. Of these, 3 million or 60 percent account for only 15 percent or even less of total farm output. These farms range in size from a few acres to just under 100 acres.

The average cropland harvested is only 18 acres per farm, altogether too little for any amount of mechanization. Efficient production is impossible on these tiny farms.

On these 18 acres, with average yields per acre and current prices, a farmer could raise a cotton crop worth about \$1,500 or a wheat crop worth about \$600 or a corn crop worth about \$750. This is the gross value of the average output of these 3 million farms, assuming that the entire 18 acres were planted in one of the 3 crops noted.

Actually, some of the 18 acres has to be planted in food for the family and feed for animals. Taxes, seed, fertilizer, insecticides, and so on, have to come out of the few hundred dollars received for sale of crops.

SCANT AID RECEIVED

Production on these farms is so small that price supports can add very little to family income. Some of these small farmers supplement their income through part-time jobs in industry, but this is not an altogether practical solution owing to transportation and distance difficulties.

Actually the Government has done a disservice to many of these small farmers by encouraging them to stay on their farms. The politicians have done them a disservice by encouraging them to believe that Washington somehow can stimulate prices of farm products sufficiently to make a real difference in their income.

Business has been crying for more workers, and there is no doubt that the great majority of these very low-income farm families would fare better in the business world than by trying to grub out a bare living from the soil.

TRANSITION POSES PROBLEMS

There are numerous problems involved in such a transition, but many farmers already have solved them as indicated by the declines in farm population during the past 20 years or so. Some governmental assistance might be needed. This is too much of a problem for the Department of Agriculture alone.

The solution probably would require the joint efforts of three governmental Departments, Agriculture, Labor, and Commerce.

The soil-bank plan might be used to pay farmers for taking these numerous small, inefficient farms out of production, although it probably would be much cheaper for the Government to buy these farms outright than to pay rent on them for a prolonged period.

LARGER FARMS NEEDED

There is no particular merit in bigness itself, but it is a fact that a farm has to be rather big today to warrant the necessary mechanization to make it efficient. The gasoline engine and rural electrification have altered the pattern of agricultural production just as much as James Watt's steam engine altered the pattern of industrial production.

The trend is definitely toward larger farms where the use of large mechanized equipment is practicable.

Agricultural economists state that, for maximum efficiency under present-day best farm practices, the size of a farm should range from 600 acres to 3,000 acres.

The 1950 census showed 304,000 farms ranging from 500 acres to over 1,000 acres. These represented only 5.7 percent of the total number of all farms at that time, but accounted for over 50 percent of all farmland and 30 percent of cropland harvested.

There are some 2 million medium and large scale farm operators whose farms range from 100 acres to over 1,000 acres. Representing 40 percent of all farmers, they account for 85 percent or more of total cropland harvested and contribute correspondingly to total farm output.

The average cropland harvested per farm is between 125 and 150 acres, as compared with only 18 acres for the 3 million small farms.

BURDENED WITH CURBS

Many of these medium and large farms are not able to operate at maximum efficiency since they are burdened with restrictions in the form of Government acreage allotments.

Price supports and restrictions on production go hand in hand, of course. The majority of these farmers are equipped to produce profitably at prices well below current levels for the price-supported crops, and they are irked at acreage controls. They need no price supports.

Undoubtedly, these 2 million farms can produce all the farm products needed for domestic consumption plus export requirements. Increased efficiency should result in lower production costs and lower prices for consumers.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder if the Senator is familiar with this little book which is entitled "Full Prosperity for Agriculture," which is published at 1001 Connecticut Avenue by the Conference on Economic Progress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I must confess to the Senator from Vermont that I have been so busy reading the bill which came from the committee that I have not had the time to read Mr. Keyserling's booklet. I have it, but I have not had an opportunity to read it.

Mr. AIKEN. It is a very complete work of the National Committee of the Conference on Economic Progress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator that the author of that booklet, in whom I have a good deal of confidence, is not yet the czar of agriculture, as the present Secretary of Agriculture will be made if this bill shall pass.

Mr. AIKEN. This is the first time I have known that Mr. Keyserling wrote this book. It was sent to me by Mr. James Patton, president of the National Farmers Union.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am looking across the aisle to the Senator. He may not have in hand the book which I thought he had.

Mr. AIKEN. It is the same one, I am sure.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If it is, the name is on it.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator agree with the proposal—and I am referring now to page 99 of the book—that it would require "the exodus from the farm population of about 2 million people by 1960" to lift the standard of living of the farmers?

In other words, does the Senator agree with Mr. Keyserling—and I am glad to know who wrote this book—that we should liquidate about 950,000 of the smallest farms in the United States within the next 4 years as proposed on page 108 of the book?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not agree with any proposal to liquidate any of the farmers of America.

Mr. AIKEN. The book is sponsored by a very distinguished group, including Mr. Keyserling, Mr. Patton, Mr. Reuther, and Mr. M. W. Thatcher.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They are distinguished gentlemen, but I speak for myself.

Mr. AIKEN. This is quite an interesting book, and I commend it to the Senator's reading. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall tell Mr. Keyserling that the Senator from Vermont has endorsed his book upon the floor of the Senate. [Laughter.]

Mr. AIKEN. I have not met anyone who knew the authorship until now.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to add a few more points for the record.

Early last week the Secretary of Agriculture was testifying before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. I was a member of that committee, and it was a very interesting session.

SECRETARY BENSON'S LETTER

The Secretary answered fully and frankly the questions propounded to him

by members of the committee. Later, on the floor of the Senate, I told the Senate what some of the questions were which I had requested the Secretary to answer, regarding what he felt about some of the issues. I have in my hand Secretary Benson's letter of March 1, 1956, responding to some of the questions which were raised at the hearing and which were mentioned by me on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, March 1, 1956.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHOONEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHOONEY: In the hearing on February 28 before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report and again that same day on the floor of the Senate, you requested certain information from me.

One item was mentioned by you on page 3459 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: "I requested Secretary Benson to have prepared an amendment which would prevent abuse of the sale of our surplus food commodities in Russia."

As Senator AIKEN responded, such an amendment was offered in his bill, S. 2949. The amendment appears on page 20, lines 8 and 9 of that bill, and reads as follows:

"Section 304 of Public Law 480, 83d Congress (68 Stat. 454), is hereby repealed."

The enactment of this amendment would permit CCC-owned agricultural commodities to be used in barter transactions with other than friendly countries.

The other item you requested appears on page 3460 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"The other question I asked the Secretary of Agriculture was this: Inasmuch as the President has expressed sympathy toward the family-sized farm, would the Secretary consider an amendment to the bill which would provide that the full 90-percent supports would be extended to the production from family-sized farms, farms operated by families, and that the flexible supports should be confined solely to corporate farms and farms of a thousand acres or more?"

First of all, the President's intent was not identical with the objective you have indicated. The President said:

"The average size of farms in American agriculture, as measured by capital or by acres, has rapidly increased. To the degree that this trend is associated with the development of more economic and more efficient farm units it is in the interest of farm families and of the Nation. To the degree, however, that it has resulted in the removal of risk for large farm businesses by reasons of price supports, it is much less wholesome and constitutes a threat to the traditional family farm."

"Under the price support machinery as it has been functioning, price support loans of tremendous size have occasionally occurred. It is not sound Government policy to underwrite at public expense such formidable competition with family-operated farms, which are the bulwark of our agriculture."

"I ask the Congress to consider placing a dollar limit on the size of price-support loans to any one individual or farming unit. The limit should be sufficiently high to give full protection to efficiently operated family farms."

Various bills have been offered which have the objective mentioned in your question. Among them are S. 2776 and S. 3027. Each of

these bills is addressed to the objective indicated by your question.

The Department of Agriculture has undertaken thorough study of the approach embodied in these bills. The National Agricultural Advisory Commission studied the problem and advised against this approach for the following reasons:

1. Providing price supports for family farms at a high and rigid level would result in giving effective support for the entire crop at that level, since by far most of our farm products are produced on family farms. The family farms would hold a price umbrella for the other farms.

2. The purpose of the legislation could be defeated, in part, by producers which would divide a large farm from a legalistic standpoint but preserve it as an operating unit.

3. Inefficiency would be encouraged and perpetuated by subsidizing farm units of uneconomic size.

Two years ago Senator DWORSHAK invited our comments on a proposal of the type you mention. We advised against this approach, as indicated in the attached copy of a letter to Senator AIKEN.

As Senator THYE indicated in his colloquy with you, legislation of the type you have in mind has been before the Senate Committee on Agriculture.

If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to call on me. The need for prompt enactment of the administration's farm proposals is urgent. The President said: "I urge the Congress to pass this program with maximum speed."

Sincerely yours,

E. T. BENSON,
Secretary.

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Mr. President, in addition to that, I made request of the Secretary of Agriculture for some information with respect to the number of farms by tenure of operator in the United States. This morning, at my office, with a memorandum dated March 2, I found two tables relating to farm tenancy and farm employment. I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum and the tables be printed at length in the RECORD.

First, however, I wish to call attention to 1 or 2 of the very interesting figures which appear.

All the farm operators in the United States in 1900 numbered 5,737,000. There was a rather general increase, which was impeded a little in 1925 and 1930, but continued until 1935. The period between 1925 and 1930 was the time of the agricultural depression, when farmers were leaving the farms.

The year 1935 was after some relief legislation had been passed. The number of farms in 1935 was 6,812,000, according to the table sent to me by the Secretary of Agriculture. That was the high point. From that time onward, the decline has been continuous.

In 1954, there were 4,782,000 farms.

In a table showing the percentage of distribution, I find these very interesting facts:

In 1900, the number of part owners was 7.9 percent of the total number of owners. In 1910, the percentage of part owners increased to 9.3 percent. In 1920 and 1925, the number was static at 8.7 percent. In 1930, the number of part owners rose to 10.4 percent. In 1935 and 1940, the number was static at 10.1 percent. In 1945, the number of part owners

was 11.3 percent of the total number of owners. In 1950, it was 15.3 percent. In 1954, it was 17.9 percent.

Those are the figures which I have received from the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would the Senator state what is meant by "part owners"?

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Part owners are those who are not the full operators.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does that mean ownership by the operator?

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Yes. The listings are "owners," "full owners," "part owners," "managers," and "tenants."

The number of family workers has been declining steadily.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Has not the percentage of tenants dropped?

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Yes, the percentage of tenants has dropped.

Mr. AIKEN. I wonder if the Senator would read the figures as to tenants.

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. In 1900 the percentage of tenants was 35.3; in 1954 it was 24.4 percent. That was because of the decrease in the number of farms, and because wealthier persons are buying small farms to make larger farms. They are buying the land of the family-size farms from farmers who cannot subsist upon low prices and who are, therefore, being driven from the farms.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator have the figure of the percentage of tenants in 1950, for instance?

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Yes. In 1940 it was 38.7 percent.

Mr. AIKEN. There has been quite a drop.

Mr. O'MAHOONEY. Yes, there has been quite a drop. The number of family workers also has dropped. In 1940, for example, the number of family workers on the farms were 8,300,000.

In 1955, the number was 6,341,000.

The number of hired workers has dropped also because of the coming of the machines.

The farm problem with which we are dealing is the farm problem which has been brought about by mechanized farming and by the increasing amount of production on the larger farms.

I have no doubt that is why the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGRISH], the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], together with other Senators, have been suggesting the adoption of an amendment by which the payment would be scaled down as the farm size increases.

SAVE THE FAMILY FARM

The corporate farm and the large farm with huge production do not need the support which the family-sized farm needs. In my opinion, from the facts which have been developed in the debate so far, the conclusion is clear that,

unless we want to see more family farms abandoned and sold out, we had better support the 90-percent-of-parity provisions of the bill reported by the committee, whatever we may do with the soil-bank proposal, which I think ought to be eliminated, because I think it needs more study. I think it was proposed in 1956 because there was a realization that there is a farm problem in the United States which has not been solved.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The lowering of price supports certainly would accelerate the liquidation of smaller farmers, would it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think there is no doubt about that.

Mr. YOUNG. I was impressed by the testimony of one of the witnesses at the hearings in Louisiana. I think he described the farm situation about as well as any of the many witnesses we heard throughout the country. He said that when the smaller cotton farmer of the South goes out of business, the bigger operator comes along and takes over the same farm. He produces much more per acre than the smaller farmer did; and thereby helps to create even larger surpluses.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no doubt about that. Not only is that true, but the large operator creates surpluses in other commodities.

There is a greater surplus of cattle in the country today than at any other time. The cattle population of the United States today is so large that there is 1 head for about every 1½ persons in the entire population.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator is familiar with agriculture in the Great Plains area. Does he not agree that as the number of large farms increases, and the smaller farms are disappearing, the small towns and cities are affected? If the trend toward bigger farms by the big farm operators continues, the little towns and cities will soon cease to exist.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The small-business men will be injured; small banks will be closed; the support for rural schools will be reduced. Unmeasured damage will be done to the social system which now exists.

I think the question of creating a soil bank by the provisions of this bill, should be treated with much greater consideration than has been given to it to date by either the Department of Agriculture or the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I say that without in any degree discounting the amount of work which the committee, under the chairmanship of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has done. I compliment him highly for the time he has spent in traveling all over the country and in getting the information from the people in the various States.

It is unquestioned that the family sized farm is disappearing, and that the industrial leaders want the family sized farms to disappear. When they shall have disappeared, the land will be taken over by the big mechanized farmers.

It is clear that the President in his agriculture message to Congress de-

clared his sympathy with the family sized farm. But if it had not been for the action of the committee in reporting a bill providing for 90-percent supports, there would be nothing in the bill which would help the small farmer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the two tables to which I have referred and the accompanying memorandum from Mr. Koenig.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE,
March 2, 1956.

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: Attached are two tables relating to farm tenancy and farm employment. Assistant Secretary Butz asked me to have these tables prepared and send them to you in response to the request which you made of him earlier this week at the hearing before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

Sincerely,

NATHAN KOENIG.

Number of farms by tenure of operator

Tenure of operator	Number of farms (thousands)									
	1900	1910	1920	1925	1930	1935	1940	1945	1950	1954
Owners.....	3,653	3,949	3,925	3,868	3,568	3,899	3,699	3,962	3,915	3,594
Full owners.....	3,202	3,355	3,367	3,313	2,912	3,210	3,084	3,301	3,090	2,737
Part owners.....	451	594	558	555	657	689	615	661	825	857
Managers.....	59	58	68	41	56	48	36	39	24	21
Tenants.....	2,025	2,355	2,455	2,463	2,664	2,865	2,361	1,858	1,444	1,169
All farm operators.....	5,737	6,362	6,448	6,372	6,289	6,812	6,097	5,859	5,382	4,782
	Percent distribution									
Owners.....	63.7	62.1	60.9	60.7	56.7	57.2	60.7	67.6	72.7	75.2
Full owners.....	55.8	52.7	52.2	52.0	46.3	47.1	50.6	56.3	57.4	57.3
Part owners.....	7.9	9.3	8.7	8.7	10.4	10.1	10.1	11.3	15.3	17.9
Managers.....	1.0	.9	1.1	.6	.9	.7	.6	.7	.4	.4
Tenants.....	35.3	37.0	38.1	38.6	42.4	42.1	38.7	31.7	26.8	24.4
All farm operators.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: Agricultural Marketing Service. Compiled from reports of the Census of Agriculture. Detail will not necessarily add to totals because of rounding.

Farm employment: Annual averages and indexes of total, family and hired, employment, United States, 1910-55

Year	Total employment		Family workers		Hired workers	
	Average number of persons	Index, 1910-14=100	Average number of persons	Index, 1910-14=100	Average number of persons	Index, 1910-14=100
	Thousands		Thousands		Thousands	
1910.....	13,555	100	10,174	100	3,381	100
1911.....	13,539	100	10,169	100	3,370	99
1912.....	13,559	100	10,162	100	3,397	100
1913.....	13,572	100	10,158	100	3,414	100
1914.....	13,580	100	10,147	100	3,433	101
1915.....	13,592	100	10,140	100	3,452	102
1916.....	13,632	101	10,144	100	3,488	103
1917.....	13,568	100	10,121	100	3,447	101
1918.....	13,391	99	10,053	99	3,338	98
1919.....	13,243	98	9,968	98	3,275	96
1920.....	13,432	99	10,041	99	3,391	100
1921.....	13,398	99	10,001	98	3,397	100
1922.....	13,337	98	9,936	98	3,401	100
1923.....	13,162	97	9,798	96	3,364	99
1924.....	13,031	96	9,705	96	3,326	98
1925.....	13,036	96	9,715	96	3,321	98
1926.....	12,976	96	9,526	94	3,450	102
1927.....	12,642	93	9,278	91	3,364	99
1928.....	12,691	94	9,340	92	3,351	99
1929.....	12,763	94	9,360	92	3,403	100
1930.....	12,497	92	9,307	92	3,190	94
1931.....	12,745	94	9,642	95	3,103	91
1932.....	12,816	95	9,922	98	2,894	85
1933.....	12,739	94	9,874	97	2,865	84
1934.....	12,627	93	9,765	96	2,862	84
1935.....	12,733	94	9,855	97	2,878	85
1936.....	12,331	91	9,350	92	2,981	88
1937.....	11,978	88	9,054	89	2,924	86
1938.....	11,622	86	8,815	87	2,807	83
1939.....	11,338	84	8,611	85	2,727	80
1940.....	10,979	81	8,300	82	2,679	79
1941.....	10,669	79	8,017	79	2,652	78
1942.....	10,504	77	7,949	78	2,555	75
1943.....	10,446	77	8,010	79	2,436	72
1944.....	10,219	75	7,988	79	2,231	66
1945.....	10,000	74	7,881	78	2,119	62
1946.....	10,295	76	8,106	80	2,189	64
1947.....	10,382	77	8,115	80	2,267	67
1948.....	10,363	76	8,026	79	2,337	69
1949.....	9,964	73	7,712	76	2,252	66
1950.....	9,342	69	7,252	71	2,090	61
1951.....	8,985	66	6,997	69	1,988	58
1952.....	8,669	64	6,748	66	1,921	57
1953.....	8,380	63	6,645	65	1,735	57
1954.....	8,451	62	6,521	64	1,930	57
1955.....	8,237	61	6,341	62	1,896	56

Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service.

**ANCHER NELSEN, ADMINISTRATOR
OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION
ADMINISTRATION**

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, ever since the establishment of the Rural Electrification Administration as an integral part of the Department of Agriculture, there has been genuine bipartisan support for its program. We are all aware of the great achievements of REA. No one knows better than I that the electrification of the Nation's farms is one of the greatest benefits that has come to the rural home. It has provided a modern home attractive to the farm youth. But above all, it has given the farm family the element of safety and added security by eliminating the kerosene lamp.

It is because of the bipartisan support for REA in the past that I am deeply disturbed and shocked by an apparent attempt to discredit the REA and its present Administrator, Ancher Nelsen. I am convinced that the attack is political, and sponsored by a certain organization not directly connected with the REA, but in a position to influence consumers of electric cooperatives who benefit from the progress made by REA.

I feel that the record should be straightened out before it becomes distorted any further. I was gratified that my distinguished colleagues from South Dakota revealed the truth about certain statements attributed to Ancher Nelsen at a meeting in St. Louis on January 8, 1956, where some of their constituents were present. Their clear and pointed statements, plus the letters from their constituents, formed an effective rebuttal to the charges made by a reporter of a Nashville, Tenn., paper on January 29, 1956.

I regret that the distinguished senior Senator from Montana saw fit to insert that article in the RECORD without verifying the facts as reported.

The charge was made that Ancher Nelsen, at a meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in St. Louis in January, forced his way into a meeting of the resolutions committee, and that he then proceeded to threaten that if they did not cooperate fully with him they would have a difficult time getting loans from REA.

This charge is pure politics, and submitted for purely political purposes. I have read letters from those present at the meeting in question. They read the newspaper account and found it to be so distorted and false that they took it upon themselves to report the true facts.

It is most regrettable that a member of the press, who is charged with reporting the facts accurately, would use this great medium of communication in such a fashion. It is also regrettable that any organization would reprint thousands of copies of the article, knowing it to be false, and circulate it nationally. This not only performs a disservice to those who are conscientiously administering the REA program, but it does a grave disservice to the patrons of REA and to the American public.

These two charges—the newspaper charge and the verbal charges in Minnesota—do not stand up in the light of the facts.

I happen to know Ancher Nelsen, REA Administrator, very well. He is one of Minnesota's most distinguished citizens. He happens to be a farmer from Hutchinson, Minn. He knows what telephones and electricity have meant to the American farmer. He remembers the day when the kerosene lamp and the wood stove furnished the light and warmth for every American farm home.

He served for many years in the Minnesota State Senate. While in that capacity he played a prominent part in drafting legislation designed to assist our rural population and the rural cooperatives in Minnesota.

Ancher Nelsen was Lieutenant Governor of Minnesota before he came to Washington in the spring of 1953. He is a man of real dedication to duty. Ancher Nelsen has never in his career used strong-arm tactics or threats. I worked closely with him when I served as Governor of Minnesota and while he was a State senator. I am in a position to vouch for his integrity and his honesty. However, many of my colleagues are not as well acquainted with him as I. Because of that I am going to briefly give them the facts concerning the progress of REA under his leadership.

These facts are well known to all, including those who have launched this political attack upon him.

First. Between July 1, 1953, and July 1, 1955, REA borrowers connected an additional 133,000 farms. These farms were getting electricity for the first time. It should be pointed out that the best areas of this Nation's farms received the benefits of REA's program in the period before Ancher Nelsen became Administrator. He is now picking up the loose ends of isolated areas.

This fact makes the accomplishments which have been mentioned even more important, because it must be remembered that the areas which have been alluded to have been passed over many times as questionable areas, because of doubt as to whether there would be enough subscribers to make a loan possible. It is for that reason that any loans made now would be to areas on the fringe or edge of those eligible, which have been passed over.

Second. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, REA made 349 electrification loans, totaling \$167.5 million. Does this reflect an insidious attack upon the REA loan program?

Third. REA loans for 1952 totaled \$165.7 million; for 1953 the figure was \$165 million; for 1954, \$167 million. Does this indicate that the REA program is being stifled?

Fourth. Because of REA assistance to cooperatives in working out power contracts, the cost of wholesale power has been reduced from 1 cent in 1941 to 7.4 mills in 1955. Can it be said that this saving of millions of dollars indicates the administration's lack of interest in rural electrification?

Fifth. In 1951, farmers on REA financed lines paid 3.6 cents a kilowatt-hour at retail for their electricity. In 1955 they paid 3 cents per kilowatt-hour. That is the lowest figure in history.

Sixth. In fiscal 1955, REA made loans for generating plants and transmission

systems in the amount of \$41 million. This will provide 10 new generating units and about 1,700 miles of transmission line.

Seventh. The amount of money on loan to REA borrowers at the present time is \$3.1 billion. The 1,026 borrowers serve over 4 million customers.

Eighth. At the end of the 1955 fiscal year, the backlog of electrification loans amounted to \$97 million, the lowest since 1945. When Ancher Nelsen took office this backlog totaled \$220 million.

Ninth. The amount of unadvanced funds for REA borrowers at the end of 1955 came to \$448 million. This represents money which has been loaned, but which borrowers do not yet need.

Tenth. REA has long had a contingency fund available. Prior to this administration, it was used but once. In fiscal 1954, \$39 million was used from the reserve; in fiscal 1955, \$35 million was used. Does this show a reluctance to finance rural-electrification systems? Of course it does not, Mr. President.

Eleventh. REA regularly conducts a survey of its borrowers, asking them to specify the loan needs in the year ahead. This provides the basis for the annual budget request for loan funds. For fiscal 1957, REA estimates such borrowers' loan needs at \$185 million, which will be met in full on the basis of the budget now before Congress. This is the highest since 1951.

Twelfth. Approximately 756 REA borrowers have made payments in advance of due date on their loans, in the amount of \$91 million.

The points I have just covered go to the heart of the rural-electrification program. It is obvious, when one looks at the facts, that the charges I have referred to are false and are intended to mislead the public. I, for one, will never play politics with the REA program. I hope that those who are attacking the program without presenting facts will consider the harm they can do to the many consumers and patrons of REA. These false charges serve to undermine public confidence in the REA program, and this must not happen for the good of REA. Rather than condemn Ancher Nelsen and the REA program, these critics would do better by coming out in the open and offering to cooperate and assist in the bipartisan spirit which should prevail—as it always has, up to now—in this great program. The record shows that Ancher Nelsen and his department are doing an effective and outstanding job.

**RECOGNITION OF SENATOR
CARLSON TOMORROW**

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, immediately following the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who has been granted unanimous consent to address the Senate immediately after the conclusion of morning business tomorrow, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

WITHDRAWALS OF PUBLIC LANDS FOR PUBLIC PURPOSES IN THE 11 WESTERN PUBLIC LAND STATES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, as one of the 11 public land States, my State of Nevada has been subjected to land withdrawals for public purposes over the last half century. During the past 15 years, large withdrawals have been made by the armed services, for use in the training of military personnel. The more than 60 million acres of unappropriated and unreserved public land, and, in addition, the approximately 5 million acres of forest-reserve land, have been completely utilized by the residents of Nevada for almost a century.

NEVADANS MAKE EFFICIENT USE OF PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. President, in our State, the livestock interests, the mining interests, and, more recently, the developing industries, are making very efficient use of this entire acreage.

Probably very few persons, except the folks in the livestock country, the public land area—realize what the livestock units are based upon. There are three parts to a livestock unit. The first is the home range, where there is enough water for irrigation, so that the feed, the hay, the grain—whatever is necessary to winter the stock—can be raised.

Then there are the water rights for irrigation and stock watering. They are water rights on the range as filed under State law over a period of nearly a century in time. If not filed in the early days they have been adjudicated so that the time of use was established.

HAY VITAL TO LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY

Then there is the public range—where, for example, at the mouth of a canyon there may be enough water to irrigate, let us say, 100 acres. In the case of ordinary hay—prairie hay, it is called in the Midwest—probably anywhere from three-quarters of a ton to 1½ tons per acre would be harvested. For the purpose of this debate, let us say that 1 ton is harvested to the acre. With 100 acres, that would amount to 100 tons of hay.

In an area north of Ely, Nev., or Tonopah, Nev., which is a little south of the central part of the State, the general estimate—in order to be safe with a herd of cattle for the average winter—would be a ton of hay per cow and calf. Sometimes during an open winter that much hay is not used. But in that event, the extra amount is saved, so that during a hard winter—which can require two tons per unit—there will be sufficient hay. If the stockmen do not have enough hay, they lose the cattle. The cattle are run on the open range. That has been the practice for almost a century. The water rights have been filed on the springs and the small stock watering places throughout the open range, under State law; and the water rights have been filed and adjudicated, for the most part, on the stream or streams that furnish the water for irrigation.

FEED ON PUBLIC RANGE HARVESTED ONLY THROUGH THE LIVESTOCK

So those three parts are necessary for a livestock unit, whether for cattle or for sheep. That is the only way the feed on the public range can be har-

vested—namely, through the livestock. Over that period of time the ranchers have worked it out.

Mr. President, there are approximately 110,000 square miles in the State of Nevada—or approximately 70,600,000 acres. Approximately 60 million acres of it are unappropriated and unreserved.

WORLD WAR II BROUGHT SHRINKAGE OF PUBLIC RANGE WITH LITTLE OBJECTION

During World War II, an area of approximately 90 miles by 100 miles in size was withdrawn for a bombing range near Tonopah, Nev. The Tonopah Airbase was established. No one thought very much about it; certainly there was not very much objection. Only the stock raisers and miners in the area objected. But that was during wartime, and no one took that withdrawal very seriously. The Government was supposed to compensate the property owners; and I think that in the main that was done. There is still considerable argument about it, but that is something that a court can always settle.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION AFFECTS SECOND HUGE WITHDRAWAL

Then, following the war, the Atomic Energy Commission occupied a large part of the public land area—part of it already appropriated—in this square of 90 miles by 100 miles. All of us are familiar with the newspaper reports about the bombing range for the atomic energy bombs. That area is being completely utilized.

NAVY DEPARTMENT ACQUIRES NEVADA AREA

Then, Mr. President, considerably later, the Navy Air Corps came to Fallon, Nev., and withdrew several areas for their operations. That included the purchase of privately-owned tracts of land. All that was with the consent of the people in the area, and presumably all of the land was to be used for a good purpose.

Then a large area was withdrawn in the Black Rock Desert, in the northern part of Nevada, for an additional large bombing range.

Mr. President, all of us know that the faster the jet planes fly, the larger the bombing areas they require. When they were flying only 250 or 300 miles an hour, that was one thing. Now they are going 4 or 5 hundred miles an hour, and looking forward to supersonic speed. As they speed up, they need more land.

NAVY SEEKS ADDITIONAL PUBLIC LANDS

Recently a request was made by the Navy for additional lands bordering upon the Black Rock Desert, located in the northern part of our State, the northern part of Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt Counties.

There is a reason for the large areas of public land. Eighty-seven percent of the land in the State of Nevada is public land. There is reason for large areas of public lands in the other western public land States. There is a small amount of public land in the Dakotas, but not very much, not enough to cause very much of a problem. Nevada has the largest percentage of public land. The reason for such large areas of public land is the lower rainfall. There has never been any public land in that area which would fit into the program of

placing it in private ownership and putting it on the tax rolls.

EARLY LAND-SETTLEMENT ACTS HIGHLIGHTED

About 100 years ago the Homestead Act was passed. Previous to that, the Preemption Act was passed, about 140 years ago. Those acts were calculated to put lands into private ownership, and therefore on the tax roll.

The program started with the Homestead Act, in the corn land States of Iowa and Indiana, immediately after the Civil War, and moved from there west. One hundred and sixty acres of land was given in return for a filing fee of \$16. That situation lasted until the program got out into western Kansas, Nebraska, and Oklahoma. The rainfall was much lighter in the western part of Kansas, the State of the present Presiding Officer [Mr. CARLSON]. One hundred and sixty acres was not enough for a farmer or a rancher to make a living. There used to be a sort of joke in this connection. The homesteaders would tell each other that the Government was betting 160 acres against \$16 that they could not make a go of it, and the Government began to win all the bets.

HOMESTEAD ACREAGE EXPANDED

So the Congress enacted what was called an additional Homestead Act, providing for 160 additional acres. That made 320 acres that could be taken up. That program lasted through western Kansas and into the short-grass country in Colorado. When it reached the mesas, 320 acres was not enough. Then there was enacted the Grazing Homestead Act. Under certain conditions an additional section of land could be acquired. Making a total of 960 acres, which would take the homesteaders across the short-grass country into a part of what was called the great American desert of Utah, Nevada, and other intermountain States.

SENATOR RECALLS PUBLIC LAND SURVEY EXPERIENCE

No further attempt was made to pass a public lands bill, so that the people utilizing the land could take up enough land to make a living. I have spent a great deal of time on those ranges. As early as 1911 I was on public land surveys in my State of Nevada, and beginning in 1914 I carried a transit over a good part of it. We were sleeping out on the desert. No one thought very much about it. We were surveying that land.

In the 1850's—that is a long time ago—people started coming into Nevada, particularly into the Virginia City area. They needed food, and feed for livestock. The ranchers began to do well, and they began to take up the land, as I have previously described.

PIONEER RANCHERS DEVELOPED COOPERATIVE UNDERSTANDINGS

In the canyons where there was enough water for a small ranch, the cattle would use the unappropriated range, the open range; and as more people came in, there began to be cooperative understandings with respect to the ridges, the canyons, and the valleys.

A man who had a hundred head of cattle would pasture them on a certain

area of the lands. Another rancher might have 150 head, or 25. In any event, there was a very amicable arrangement, until the range began to be overappropriated.

WATER RIGHTS PROTECTED

The State of Nevada then entered the picture, and passed a stock water law. I shall make it a part of the RECORD later. It was provided that when anyone filed an appropriation for stock water on a range, the State engineer could refuse the application if the range was already substantially utilized under a subsisting right. All this was done under the police power of the State. The Supreme Court of Nevada held it to be constitutional. I have no doubt that it is constitutional. Certainly it worked very well.

MINERS AND RANCHERS THRIVED AMICABLY

Mining, of course, went on during all of that time. Mining does not interfere with cattle or sheep on the ranges. Whenever a mine was discovered, operations proceeded, and everyone was cooperative. At least, there was no interference. That is the way the taxable property in the State of Nevada and other public land States developed, with the exception, of course, of the States on the Pacific Coast, which had other resources, such as harbors, shipping, and other things. However, the mining States were largely developed in that manner.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT OF NEVADA MORE RECENT

In recent years industries have started to come into the State. They will come whenever there are power, water, and other favorable factors affecting the feasibility of the industry. Industry in our State, of course, had a great boost when the Hoover Dam was constructed. I was State engineer from 1927 to 1935, and administered the Stock Water Act, which I have just described, and which I shall place in the RECORD later.

I cooperated with the Department of the Interior while Hoover Dam was being constructed. In the division of power and water, I represented my State.

NEVADA INDUSTRIES EXPANDING

That is not the only industry. There are smaller industries scattered throughout the State of Nevada, in the population centers, especially large mining operations such as the Anaconda Mining Co., which has gone into Yerington, Nev., 100 miles southeast of Reno. One of the largest copper pits in the world is located in Ely, Nev., where the Kennicott Copper Co. is located. There are many smaller investments.

PROSPECTORS BEING RUINED BY IMPORTS FROM LOW-WAGE COUNTRIES

Those mines, of course, are discovered by prospectors who used to be present all the time when we had a policy which protected the investor and the working man in their standard of living. We have just about chased the prospectors out, because even when a prospector finds a mineral outcrop today, it develops that that mineral can be shipped into the United States from some lower wage-standard-of-living country cheaper than it can be mined in this country.

LARGE LAND WITHDRAWALS NEW THREAT TO NEVADA'S ECONOMY

Now come these large land withdrawals. As I have said, large land withdrawals were accentuated during World War II. There is pending an application for a large additional area, consisting of several million acres on public lands.

I have had experience in the State since 1911, especially since 1927, when I became the State engineer. My experience also includes private engineering practice, and my experience as a United States Senator. I have been aware all the time that at some time there would have to be a State policy; there would have to be some method of determining what lands, if any, should be withdrawn, and what would be in the best interests of the State of Nevada, the State of Utah, and other public-land States, in the utilization of these lands.

SENATOR ADDRESSES NEVADA STATE LEGISLATURE ON PROBLEM

So, Mr. President, I took occasion, following the time when I was in Chicago delivering an address before the Abraham Lincoln Club on the 11th of February, to go home. I started in the eastern part of my State and traveled throughout the northern, western, and southern parts of the State. I conferred with many people. While I was there, the legislature was in special session, and I addressed the Senate and the assembly on this particular question.

I said there was little use in asking me in Washington to do something for a certain area or to prevent something from being done in another area, with one being dependent upon another, if the State did not have a policy. I said the State must adopt a policy. If the State adopted such a policy, I said I would be willing to do whatever the State wanted to be done.

CONFERS WITH GOVERNOR

I also had two conferences with our Governor, Charles Russell, who previously served one term in the House of Representatives. He now is the governor of our State.

Governor Russell agreed with me that a State policy must be adopted, and that it was too much to expect us to sit still while a Government department comes into a particular part of our State to withdraw large areas of land and destroy the livestock industry, the mining industry, or any other industry, without having some rhyme or reason or policy to go by.

EARLY CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN SENATOR AND GOVERNOR ON NAVY EFFORT MADE PUBLIC

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Governor of Nevada and a telegraphic enclosure, dated July 27, 1955, together with my answer.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEVADA,

Carson City, July 27, 1955.

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE,

United States Senator,

Senate Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: Attached is a copy of a telegram I sent to the Secretary of the Navy protesting the withdrawal of 2,026,800 acres

Nevada territory in Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt Counties by the Navy for use as bombing range.

Anything you can do to assist in blocking this withdrawal will be greatly appreciated.

With every best wish,

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES,

Charles H. Russell,

Governor.

CARSON CITY, NEV., July 27, 1955.

HON. CHARLES S. THOMAS,

Secretary of the Navy,

Department of Defense,

Washington, D. C.:

Heartily join with Nevada Fish and Game Commission in opposing withdrawal 2,026,800 acres in northern Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt Counties of Nevada by Navy for use as bombing range. Majority that area comprises some Nevada's best wildlife habitat for chukars, sagehen, mule deer, and antelope. Further, some Nevada's largest ranches and mining operations involved, which, if eliminated will have adverse effect economy of State.

CHARLES H. RUSSELL,
Governor of Nevada.

AUGUST 6, 1955.

HON. CHARLES H. RUSSELL,

Governor of the State of Nevada,

Carson City, Nev.

DEAR CHARLIE: I had your letter of July 27, requesting my assistance in blocking the withdrawal of 2,026,800 acres of Nevada territory in Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt Counties by the Navy for use as a bombing range.

You may know that I attended a meeting of the people of Lovelock and heard the difficulties they were having with the Navy, and the Administration of Defense officials, and that I did arrange for the top Navy officials from San Francisco to come to Lovelock and meet with them.

I understood that out of this meeting came a very clear understanding of the areas desired by the Navy, and how the private property would be appraised and paid for, and my impression has been from the communications from citizens of that area who attended the meeting, including Paul Gardner, that it was well on the way to a settlement.

When I received your letter, I immediately communicated with the Administration of National Defense top officials, apprised them of my interest in the situation, and asked them to let me know exactly how the situation stood at this moment, and just what interest they had in this land, and what the overall effect would be if they were denied its use. I am attaching a copy of their August 4 letter to me, which is self-explanatory, signed by Thomas A. Callaghan, Jr., Special Assistant for Facilities, Department of the Navy.

I then visited Mr. Callaghan in his office at the Pentagon, who is in complete charge of the situation, and he was very clear in his explanation that while additional large future expenditures were contemplated in building up the Fallon Air Base, that probably it would be necessary to abandon the field if they were unable to secure the additional range.

Due to the extreme importance and the far-reaching consequences of the decision in this matter, I thought it best for Mr. Callaghan to write you direct about it since I have already assured him that my position will be governed by the position of the State administrator and the people of my State.

Due to the extreme importance of this decision, I am taking the liberty of forwarding a copy of the correspondence to Mr. Paul Gardner, of Lovelock, who has spearheaded the investigation there, and to Mr. Claude Smith, and Mr. Calvin Sunderland, at Fallon.

I am leaving today for Russia and the satellite countries on a trip that has been long planned in connection with the work of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. I cannot now fix the exact date of my return, but Jock Taylor, my executive secretary here will follow through on any plan that you may decide upon in connection with the Fallon and Lovelock people.

I will look forward to hearing from you, and will, of course, be home as soon as I return from Russia. The plan at this time is to proceed through Europe, through the satellite countries of Russia, Siberia, Kamchatka, and home.

Sincerely,

GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator.

SENATOR'S CORRESPONDENCE WITH THE NAVY
DEPARTMENT REPORTED

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD correspondence between the Special Assistant for Facilities, Navy Department, and myself, and a letter sent to me on September 26, 1955, by the Assistant Chief of Naval Operations with reference to the Navy's position at that time by the Navy of Air Force ranges in Nevada.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 6, 1955.

Mr. THOMAS A. CALLAGHAN, Jr.,
Special Assistant for Facilities,
Office of the Secretary,
Department of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CALLAGHAN: I have received your letters of August 4, and that of Thomas S. Gates, Acting Secretary of the Navy. Your explanation seems to be very clear that the continued development of the Fallon area depends upon securing adequate range, and at the moment the only range available is that described in your letter.

I am communicating with Gov. Charles H. Russell relative to the situation in connection with his wire to Charles S. Thomas, the Secretary of the Navy, voicing his "opposition to the withdrawal of 2,026,800 acres Nevada territory in Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt Counties by the Navy for use as a bombing range."

I understand from our visit, and from your letter of August 4, that the Navy would very probably lose interest in building up the Fallon Air Base if they were unable to secure proper range. The seriousness to our people in Nevada cannot be overestimated.

The employment of the Fallon Air Base is very much appreciated by all the citizens of Nevada, and I know that there would be great reluctance to do anything that would jeopardize the success of the base. On the other hand, the withdrawal of large acres of land in our State for bombing use where taxable property is or has been, or is being developed, is also a serious matter.

In view of the extreme importance of the decision to be made by the people of my State, I am enclosing copy of my letter to Governor Russell and if, in accordance with your letter, it is a matter of deciding whether to withdraw the land in the three counties mentioned for a bombing range, or ceasing the development of the Fallon Air Base, the decision is indeed a serious and far-reaching one and must be made by our own people.

Will you please keep me apprised of your decision in the matter and if anything further may be done on my part to assist you.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, August 4, 1955.

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MALONE: This is in response to your request for the latest information concerning the proposed Sahwave Mountain and Black Rock Desert air-to-air gunnery ranges for the naval auxiliary air station, Fallon, Nev.

The area to be acquired for these ranges totals 2,629,760 acres. These ranges are needed to provide adequate areas for our pilots to conduct simulated combat air-to-air gunnery practice in high-speed jet planes.

At the present time, the only area available to the Navy for these operations is the 272,000-acre Black Rock Desert air-to-air gunnery range. This range is so small that the Navy cannot provide adequate gunnery training for our carrier pilots based in the San Francisco Bay area. It is proposed, therefore, to acquire the following additional area:

(a) Basic Sahwave Mountain air-to-air gunnery range (602,880 acres);

(b) Proposed extension to Sahwave Mountain air-to-air gunnery range (654,720 acres);

(c) Proposed extension to Black Rock Desert air-to-air gunnery range (1,372,160 acres).

Action to acquire 602,880 acres in the basic Sahwave Mountain air-to-air gunnery range (area (a) above) is currently nearing completion. The basic Sahwave Mountain range includes 547,906 acres withdrawn from the public domain and 54,974 acres of private land currently leased from three separate owners.

There are nine known mining claims or groups of claims within the basic range, and leases have been negotiated with six of these. A condemnation proceeding has heretofore been instituted with regard to one of the claims. Negotiations are still continuing with respect to the other two claims with reasonable prospects of success.

There are six parties having grazing rights, and satisfactory agreements have been negotiated with these six interests which will permit them to continue using the ranges for grazing purposes on a year-round basis. During two months of the year, air-to-air target gunnery operations will be stopped, and the ranges will be shut down for round-up purposes.

The ranges will not be used for bombing purposes. Instead, as I indicated above, they will be used for air-to-air gunnery practice. Expanded bullets or rocket cases might occasionally hit cattle in the area. These agreements also provide, therefore, that the Government will reimburse the cattlemen for any cattle that may be killed as a result of our operations.

It will be necessary, however, to institute condemnation proceedings for the basic Sahwave Mountain range, excepting those interests as to which voluntarily leases have already been negotiated, in order to provide a vehicle for the settlement of interests or claims which are presently unknown and for the ejection of trespassers without the need of commencing separate actions in each instance.

Virtually all of the proposed extension of the Sahwave Mountain range (654,720 acres) and the proposed extension to the Black Rock Desert range (1,372,160 acres) is public domain land. On June 24, 1955, the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, issued a temporary withdrawal order at Navy's request, covering the 2,026,880 acres in the two areas. Surveys of the precise areas ultimately to be withdrawn are currently in progress, and appraisals of the various mineral claims are being made. It will probably be a year before complete withdrawal action can be concluded.

Ultimately, of course, we intend to acquire possession, title, and interest to all outstanding rights in these ranges, subject, however, to grazing rights. Thus, our present leasing action is only interim in nature, and six of our leases do contain purchase options. In any event, grazing will be permitted to continue in these areas, and we propose to negotiate grazing agreements similar to those outlined above.

The areas to be used for actual gunnery purposes will not extend to the outermost boundaries of the ranges. Instead, safety corridors, varying in width to as much as 5 to 7 miles from the boundaries of the range, will surround the entire area. Thus, while one corner of the proposed range comes to within 6 miles of Lovelock, the actual gunnery area will be approximately 14 miles from Lovelock, and all firing will be directed into the range—thus eliminating any possible danger to Lovelock.

All approaches to both the Sahwave Mountain and the Black Rock Desert ranges will be adequately posted to warn off any prospectors, casual visitors, etc.

I am advised that there now appears to be a general understanding of the Navy's need for these areas and that the public reaction is generally favorable.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS A. CALLAGHAN, Jr.,
Special Assistant for Facilities
(For the Assistant Secretary of the Navy
(Material).)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF
NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, D. C., September 26, 1955.
HON. GEORGE MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MALONE: I regret the delay in replying to your letter of July 1, 1955, which was referred to me by the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, enclosing a letter from Mr. Paul K. Gardner, secretary of the Pershing County Chamber of Commerce, Lovelock, Nev., regarding the Navy's acquisition of land for the Sahwave Mountain-Black Rock Desert Air-to-Air Gunnery Range in Nevada. This delay was necessary in order to assemble the information on which this reply is based.

The survey referred to in Mr. Gardner's letter was a mineral survey conducted by the Atomic Energy Commission and was not for the purpose of including any additional land in the proposed weapons training area.

Aerial gunnery can be confined to offshore areas in localities off the main shipping lanes where the weather is suitable. However, the prevalent low-lying stratus clouds in the west coast offshore areas and the extensive shipping encountered there have so restricted and reduced the gunnery training which can be accomplished that the squadrons must deploy to uninhabited inland areas for such training or be deficient in this vital phase.

The Naval Auxiliary Air Station at Fallon, Nev., is the gunnery satellite field for all fleet squadrons based in the San Francisco area. The sole purpose of this multi-million-dollar installation is to provide training facilities for these units. With the advent of faster, higher flying aircraft and new aircraft weapons, the existing 272,000-acre Black Rock Desert Gunnery Range has become inadequate for the Navy's requirements. Therefore, unless adequate ranges are provided, the combat training of our pilots will be severely curtailed.

The possibility of joint use with the Air Force of their existing ranges has been fully explored. The Air Force ranges in this region are saturated by their own sortie rate and are unable to accommodate our requirements.

In view of the aforementioned requirements, the Navy is in the process of acquiring

an additional area of 602,880 acres for an air-to-air gunnery range designated as the Basic Sahwave Mountain Gunnery Range. It is our intention to acquire an additional 1,372,160 acres for the expansion of the existing Black Rock Desert Gunnery Range and 654,720 acres for the expansion of the Basic Sahwave Mountain Gunnery Range. This would provide a weapons training area approximately 100 miles long and 40 miles wide containing a total of 2,901,760 acres, or approximately 4,534 square miles. Of this 4,534-square-mile area, about half is located in Pershing County. The Seven Troughs Range and a portion of the Trinity Range would be included in the area; however, the town of Sulphur would not.

On June 24, 1955, the Navy requested the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior to withdraw 2,026,880 acres from the public domain in order to provide the area needed for these two extensions. While this would indicate that all of the area consists of public-domain lands, actually in the proposed extension to the Black Rock Desert Gunnery Range, there are 10,200 acres of Indian reservation land and 32,000 acres of privately owned lands.

The acquisition of public-domain land would be without cost to the Navy, and it is our intention to acquire ownership of all privately owned tracts in the Sahwave Mountain-Black Rock Desert Gunnery Range, as extended, upon receipt of authorization and appropriation from Congress. The Navy will pay fair value for all interests acquired. The cost of this is estimated to be \$7 million.

Your interest in this project is greatly appreciated, and I hope that this information will give you a better understanding of the Navy's position.

Sincerely yours,

W. L. REES,

Rear Admiral, United States Navy,
Assistant Chief of Naval Operations
(Air) by Direction.

GOVERNOR THANKS SENATOR FOR WORK ON
WITHDRAWAL PROBLEM

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Governor of Nevada dated August 15, 1955, which is in line with the requested withdrawal.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEVADA,
CARSON CITY, August 15, 1955.

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: Thank you for your cooperation in the problem connected with the Navy's announced intention of withdrawing large sections of territory in Washoe, Pershing and Humboldt counties.

I appreciated your thoughtfulness in sending me a copy of the letter you received from Thomas A. Callaghan, Jr., Special Assistant for Facilities to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

I shall look forward to your promised visit when you return from Russia.

With every best wish,
Sincerely yours,

CHARLES

Charles H. Russell,
Governor of Nevada.

NEVADA LEGISLATURE ASSEMBLY ASKS END TO
"NAVY LAND GRABS"

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on February 16, 1956, I received a letter from Mr. John Koontz, secretary of state of Nevada, together with a copy of assembly resolution No. 5, relative to this important subject. In short, the

resolution requests that there be no further withdrawals in the area. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter and resolution printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEVADA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Carson City, Nev., February 10, 1956.
Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I enclose herewith certified copy of assembly resolution No. 5 as required by said resolution.

With kindest regards I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN KOONTZ,
Secretary of State.

STATE OF NEVADA,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

I, John Koontz, the duly elected, qualified and acting secretary of state of the State of Nevada, do hereby certify that the annexed is a true, full and correct copy of the original assembly resolution No. 5 now on file and of record in this office.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand affixed the great seal of State, at my office, in Carson City, Nev., this 10th day of February A. D. 1956.

[SEAL]

JOHN KOONTZ,
Secretary of State.

Resolution memorializing the Nevada congressional delegation and the Honorable CLAIRE ENGLE, Congressman from California, to oppose the Navy land grab

Whereas a large and extensive area of Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt Counties is in extreme danger of being removed from the tax rolls of this State by the acquisition of the same by the United States Navy for use as a bombing range; and

Whereas if the proposed Navy acquisition becomes a fact great damage may be done to the mining and ranching industries, to the fish and game resources, and to the tax structures of these several counties; and

Whereas the United States Navy has already acquired the Black Rock Desert, extending roughly over 90 miles long from Gerlach to Winnemucca, and if their practice bombs cannot hit the Black Rock Desert now, what good would they be in wartime; and

Whereas there is in existence at the present time the bombing range near Tonopah, consisting of an area of nearly 4 million acres: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada (jointly), That the Nevada congressional delegation and the Honorable CLAIRE ENGLE, Congressman from the State of California, are hereby memorialized by this legislature assembled in special session to oppose vigorously the Navy land grab proposed in the State of Nevada; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of State to each of our Senators and to our Representative in the Congress of the United States and to the Honorable CLAIRE ENGLE, Congressman from the State of California.

CONCURRENT NEVADA RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on February 21, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 3 was introduced by Senators Black and Cord. The concurrent resolution was later sidetracked in favor of another one. However, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point, at a matter of information.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 3

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Nevada congressional representatives to use their best offices to halt the acquisition of public domain and resources in Nevada by the United States Navy

Whereas existing withdrawals from the public domain inventory by the Federal defense agencies exceed in area the combined acreage of the States of Massachusetts, Maryland, New Hampshire, and Delaware; and

Whereas if present applications for similar withdrawals in Nevada, California, New Mexico, and Arizona are approved, an additional land mass equal in size to the States of New Jersey and Rhode Island, plus 50 Districts of Columbia, will have also been taken for exclusive use; and

Whereas present withdrawals by the Federal defense agencies are equivalent to a strip of land 11 miles wide extending from New York City to San Francisco, and pending applications, if approved, will increase the width of such corridor to 14 miles; and

Whereas many such withdrawals duplicate each other; and

Whereas there is pending an application by the United States Navy to obtain exclusive use of approximately 3 million acres of Federal and private acreage in Washoe, Humboldt, and Pershing Counties, State of Nevada; and

Whereas there is also pending an application by the United States Navy to obtain exclusive use of approximately 1 million acres in Esmeralda County, Nev., and Inyo County, Calif.; and

Whereas the State of Nevada has heretofore contributed to the national defense more acres of public domain and resources thereof than any other State in the Union, the total of which being in excess of 4 million acres; and

Whereas the Nevada Farm Bureau Federation, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the American National Cattlemen's Association, and other economic and citizens' groups including numerous conservation organizations in California and Nevada, and the Nevada Fish and Game Commission, and approximately 150 citizens have already joined in protest against the aforementioned applications now pending in this State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Nevada (the Assembly concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Nevada, in special session assembled, does hereby memorialize the Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE, the Honorable ALAN BIBLE, and the Honorable CLIFTON YOUNG, Nevada's Senators and Representative in the Congress of the United States, to use their best efforts and offices to halt and forbid the United States Navy from acquiring the aforementioned acreage in Washoe, Humboldt, Pershing, and Esmeralda, Counties, State of Nevada; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he hereby is, directed to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to each of our congressional representatives named above.

FURTHER RESOLUTIONS REPORTED

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, Mr. Charles Hendel, assemblyman from Mineral County, also introduced a resolution on this subject. It was passed by the assembly and later passed out of the committee of the senate, by a vote of 8 to 1. It did not pass the senate because attention was called to the fact that in a special session a joint resolution would have to be sent up by the Governor. This has not been sent up by the Governor. It was considered in the closing hours

of the session, and therefore it was not passed. It was passed by the assembly, and it was approved by the senate committee. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution requesting the Governor to appoint Federal lands legislative commission

Whereas the United States Navy has declared that it is necessary for it to acquire approximately 2,800,000 acres of additional gunnery range in Humboldt, Pershing, and Washoe Counties for jet-plane gunnery practice; and

Whereas the precarious Nevada State and local tax situation is a matter of great concern to the people of the State, being aggravated by the imposition of Federal restrictions on the development of the State's principle asset, its mining industry, which, though stimulated in part by Federal defense purchase of strategic minerals, is yet nevertheless inadequate to meet the increased needs of State and local funds for our greatly expanded educational program which our rapidly growing student population requires; and

Whereas as a consequence of our growing population it has been necessary for our legislators to enact a sales tax and increased gambling tax laws to support this newly expanded education program; and

Whereas, due to the restrictions placed on the development of our mining industry and the prohibitions placed on the production and free-market sale of gold, the principal cost-carrying metal in many of our strategic metal mines, for which there is a vast peacetime and national defense need, many millions of dollars worth of valuable mining properties now lie idle, and once prosperous mining camps, once prosperous communities, and the mines and reduction plants therein lie in wreck and ruin—and millions of dollars of the State and Nation's taxpayers' private enterprise investments have already been lost to the investors, and as many more millions of dollars in properties yet intact are threatened with the same fate; and

Whereas there are now before Congress measures which would provide for the rehabilitation of the mining industry in an effort to restore the sound economy of the mining States of the West; and

Whereas the restoration of free enterprise as it may apply to mining in all of its phases, including the return to the free production and marketing of gold would, as far as the State of Nevada is concerned, restore that sound economy, and assure a stabilized operation and certain, dependable employment, both of which must be developed and maintained if a sound economy and a dependable tax structure are to be gained and maintained; and

Whereas since the education of our children is paramount, not only in the State of Nevada but throughout the Nation, and our actual survival depends upon the degree of education the State and the Nation can provide for students, especially the sciences which have developed the advance types of materials of offense and defense, and the multitude of peacetime applications of these and other hitherto unknown great forces of nature, it does not seem unreasonable to the people of Nevada that they should be so deeply concerned over what the inroads will be on their already established, expanded educational program if this additional penalty which is now planned to be imposed upon the State is exacted by the further withdrawal of millions of additional acres of our State's public domain, unless substan-

tial reimbursement to the affected counties and the State is made; and

Whereas a stalemate seems to have been reached between the State of Nevada and the Federal Government in the land of further land withdrawals, and it is felt imperative that the Governor of the State should continually be kept advised of any action taken or proposed which may, in any way or manner, be, or be thought to be, detrimental to the best interests of the people of the State, directly or indirectly, or where such withdrawals threaten to adversely affect the Nevada State and local tax structures; and

Whereas it is expressly set forth herewith that no final acceptance of any plan of public withdrawal of public lands within the State of Nevada shall be approved except with the approval of the senate and assembly of the State of Nevada in session, and that further, any release by the State of Nevada of any of its valued public lands, whatever the consideration therefor, must include a sum sufficient to meet 50 percent of the Nevada State public school costs, with no centralized Federal Government strings attached, since this acquisition of millions of acres of additional lands by the Government, and a further continuation of federally imposed mining restrictions only constricts free enterprise in its privately financed steps toward the full and final development of the mines of the State, upon which potential—the legislature depends for the major portions of funds which our extended school program will require, and, unless sustained—not only our school program but our entire State and local tax structure will fail: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of Nevada (the Senate concurring), That the Governor appoint a Federal lands legislative committee, consisting of the legislative commission, the attorney general, the surveyor general, the inspector of mines, and five private citizens qualified to represent the interest of parties adversely affected in case of the continuation of such withdrawals, and such committee shall function in the matter of Federal withdrawal of public lands in Nevada as the Governor may direct.

PROTESTS BY COUNTIES, FARM ORGANIZATIONS, AND CITIZENS CITED

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have received several resolutions and communications from the county commissioners of the three counties I have named, Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt, and from farm bureaus and other organizations, and from individuals in those areas, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WINNEMUCCA, NEV., February 3, 1956.

HON. GEORGE MALONE,
Senator from Nevada,

Washington, D. C.:

Wish to remind you that Humboldt County Farm Bureau has gone on record as being opposed to withdrawal from production and tax rolls of our ranching, mineral, and recreational resources for gunnery range use.

LESLIE J. STEWART,
President, Humboldt County Farm
Bureau.

WASHOE COUNTY
GAME MANAGEMENT BOARD,
Reno, Nev., August 18, 1955.

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: We wish at this time to advise you of our concern in regard to the proposed withdrawal of land in Per-

shing, Humboldt, and Washoe Counties in the State of Nevada for the use of the Navy as a bombing area.

First, from the standpoint of the State tax structure, this most definitely would be a detriment to the smaller counties who depend upon mining and livestock raising for a great portion of their tax money.

Secondly, as we understand the provisions of some of the agreements with existing livestock units, there is a possibility that, in addition to loss of tax on real property, multiple use now enjoyed on all federally owned lands would be eliminated.

Thirdly, as already voiced by our State Fish and Game Commission, many thousands of acres of our better big game and upland bird areas would be taken from the people of the State of Nevada. This Board, which is established by law for the purpose of advising the State Fish and Game Commission and other governmental agencies of the needs of the county game management, feels that requirements of the Navy can be handled without this withdrawal.

We respectfully suggest that in lieu of such withdrawal our Government considers consolidating use of such lands already withdrawn and in possession of the Air Corps, Navy, and AEC within the borders of the State of Nevada.

Very truly yours,
LEE M. BURGE, Chairman.

VAUGHAN SADDLE SHOP,
Reno, Nev., August 1, 1955.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Regarding proposed bombing range in northern Washoe County, I think it would be a crime to use that area for bombing or gunnery because it is the last decent area for hunting within reasonable driving range of Reno. At present, it is an excellent range for deer, antelope, sagehen, and Chukkar partridge and several thousand cattle. Saddest part is that the range would be ruined permanently due to duds—unexploded bombs.

Will appreciate any attention you can give to this matter.

Sincerely yours,
R. C. VAUGHAN.

PERSHING COUNTY
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Lovelock, Nev., June 27, 1955.

United States Senator GEORGE MALONE,
United States Senator ALAN BIBLE,
Congressman CLIFF YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIENDS: We have it on reliable reports that Army engineers are surveying a large, new slice of Pershing County with the evident purpose of including it in the Naval Aerial Gunnery Range.

Included are the Seven Troughs and Trinity Range regions.

This is going too far. These are recognized mining districts. The present range under contest takes in about one-third of our county—almost 9,000 square miles. We do not want to have the rest eliminated from mining life of this county. We understand they are including Sulphur.

How they can avoid shooting up the Western Pacific, we don't know.

Before things get along too far, we would like to receive your aid in calling a halt to this program.

Quicksilver and antimony interest are picking up here. A number of outside interests are prospecting prospective properties. The guaranteed quicksilver price has bolstered one of our most dangerous and abused mining industries.

Thanks for your help.

In haste,
PAUL K. GARDNER,
Secretary.

ORMSBY SPORTSMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Carson City, Nev., August 3, 1955.
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: With reference to the proposed expanded Navy bombing and gunnery range planned for the northwestern part of Nevada, the members of the Ormsby Sportsmen's Association wish to prevail upon you to prevent, if possible, the annexation of the wildlife habitat for antelope, deer, sagehen, and chukkar, so that this area will remain available to Nevada hunters.

As you well know, the regions open to public hunting are being restricted more and more each year or lost entirely for one reason or another, and for the type game mentioned above the areas in Nevada are presently limited and few.

We realize the importance of national defense and the need for military installations, but it is difficult to understand why such a large area is to be restricted. Already there is a tremendous area used for the same purposes by another branch of the Armed Services in southern Nevada.

The 250 members of this organization, and other interested parties, wish to go on record opposing the additional annexation that will include this wildlife area, and solicit your aid.

Thank you for your consideration.
Sincerely,

JOHN E. BAWDEN,
President,
Ormsby Sportsmen's Association.

Edmond C. Gubler, S. B. Ceodras, N. L. Knowten, O. W. Walker, Max E. Lamb, Charles H. Mathiesen, Robert Sharp, Herbert Gillie, Robert Johnson, Jr., R. N. Coates, L. M. Pears, H. J. Christie, D. J. Jolley, Donald J. Crosby, Harold B. Wright, Ernest R. McKerham, Stanley W. Springmeyers, Ralph D. Barrett, Harold E. Hansen, Pete DePrat, J. B. Nauman, Harry E. Jweetpauth, Harry M. Ogan, Jr., A. M. Woodgate, H. N. Shene, John F. Smales, Chester T. Wooder, William L. Nagel, Drauk B. Mcought, Jack R. Cooney, Ardean M. Fields, Wals Gauggi, D. E. Beming, W. R. Hann, A. Payge, Glen Stevens, Paul R. Sargant, Frank E. Clock, R. G. Terry, William A. Penkin, E. S. Gregory, Louis K. Koontz, Frank W. Wilson, Jr., Carl A. Springmeyer, Nelson H. Jacques, C. H. Carstens, D. K. Jewett, E. F. DoRiccio, C. E. Mex, Edmond Muth, W. E. Norton, W. C. Wilson, John J. Haffey, Forrest L. Larmenter, Wm. V. Bowman, Russel C. Hill, Wallace Hesse, Albert T. Lavid, Thomas S. Morrison, Stanley F. Pochop, Eugene Pierett, R. Huantin, Charles Z. Hill, Jr., L. O. Gingles, R. E. Whitford, J. A. Lindsey, V. H. Stafford, Hugh E. Brinson, Able Riehl, Charles S. Peters, C. H. Meyers, Charles Fellesina, Jack G. Bird, Roy O. Sease, S. H. Anderson, Ed Springmeyers, M. Lamb, Jud Lamb, Henry S. Coleman, Raymond H. Eblers, Paul J. Dube, Joseph L. Jones, W. H. Gibson, H. G. Dorsey, G. B. Westenhofer, Roy B. Wise, Roy M. Whitacer, Jr., R. E. Eldredge, J. H. Sullivan, L. W. Little, R. G. Whittemore, Geo. J. Allison, Robert List, F. A. Davis, D. W. Fletcher, Paul Rubin, Richard L. Menzler, James E. Pomeroy, James C. Hodge, Harold G. Kinspect, Norman D. Noleware, William H. Shewan.

PERSHING ROD AND GAME CLUB,
Loveloek, Nev., September 1, 1955.
MR. E. R. GREENSLET,
Bureau of Land Management,
Department of Interior,
Federal Building, Reno, Nev.

DEAR SIR: The Pershing Rod and Gun Club, recognized officially as representing the sportsmen of Pershing County, hereby goes on record as opposing the proposed withdrawal of land in Pershing County under application Serial No. Nevada 040230.

The proposed closing of land to civilian use in the areas designated would mean the loss of a large part of sporting opportunities

for our hunters. In the proposed withdrawal in this county are areas we have especially propagated Chukar partridges. Besides, this area is one of the most important for sagehen hunting. In addition, is has antelope and deer.

The club also regrets to see this area taken because of its economic value to its members, many of whom depend upon ranching and mining for a living. You are taking one of our oldest, yet newest, mining areas away from civilian use. Where our members are not employers, they are employees and work in this area for 50 years has helped support them, their fathers and their families.

Copies of this protest are being sent to our delegation in Congress, in Washington, D. C.
Yours very truly,

EDNA VAN REED,
Secretary.

THE REVIEW-MINER,
Loveloek, Nev., March 3, 1956.

DEAR GEORGE: Your announcement of opposition sent a thrill around Loveloek.

Thanks for your valiant fight, for unlocking secrecy of the Navy last summer and helping us with a difficult task for fighting for Nevada's basic industries.

Good luck.

Sincerely,

PAUL K. GARDNER,
Publisher.

CONCERNING THE UNITED STATES NAVY'S PROPOSAL TO ACQUIRE 3,100,000 ACRES OF NORTHWESTERN NEVADA, INCLUDING PUBLIC DOMAIN AND PRIVATE LANDS, AND INTERESTS IN MINING PROPERTIES ON THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

Objection is made to this plan by the Pershing County Chamber of Commerce, an organization consisting of practically all businessmen in Pershing County. Approximately three-eighths of this county would be taken out of civilian use under the Navy's plan.

In addition, the following groups have protested against the plan:

1. The Pershing County Board of Commissioners.
2. The Humboldt County Board of Commissioners.
3. The Washoe County Board of Commissioners.
4. The Governor of Nevada, who has a delay in this and similar acquisitions until a study can be made.
5. The Nevada Legislative Assembly.
6. A senate committee, consisting of committees on livestock, agriculture, and mining, by a vote of 8 to 1.
7. The Nevada State Mining Association.
8. The Nevada State Advisory Council, Roy Hardy, chairman.
9. The Western Mining Council.
10. The Nevada Fish and Game Commission.
11. The Pershing Rod and Gun Club.
12. The Humboldt County Sportsmen's Club.
13. Fifty-four livestockmen, owning ranching interests in the area, organized into a protesting association, with Attorney Forrest Cooper their representative.
14. The Pershing County Farm Bureau.
15. The Nevada State Farm Bureau.
16. The Humboldt Chamber of Commerce.
17. The Wells Chamber of Commerce.

It is exceedingly difficult to oppose the Navy's plan, for that organization has huge resources, large numbers of specialists working on the project, available witnesses in Washington, D. C., at Government expense, and the advantage of working secretly on the plan for 2 years.

Only our representatives in Congress can properly represent us. We are delighted that Senator GEORGE W. MALONE has volunteered to champion this fight on our behalf.

A survey shows that the largest element wanting to cut into Nevada's basic industry—mining, agriculture, and livestock—are the spendthrift groups—the gambling and liquor people.

We are reliably advised that even the community of Fallon, Nev., is evenly divided pro and con on the subject. A private telephone conversation with Mayor Dan Evans should confirm this.

ELIMINATION OF THE MINING INDUSTRY

Pershing County's mineral development will be permanently reduced by the Navy's plan.

This region has just been opened up through access road into it with a revelation of vast mineral resources—speaking of the Sahwawe Range, situated in the western part of Pershing County. It can be considered virgin mining territory, much as the Colorado has proven to be with uranium.

In addition to the Sahwawe region, sometime referred to as the "lava bad region," there is the north and eastern part of the county which is rich in mineral resources.

In the Rosebud area Robert Chandler has 4 claims of 3.95 percent titanium with an estimated tonnage of 4 million in sight. This coming strategic metal will be eliminated.

South and west of this area, in the Cow Creek district, there are several square miles of perlite ore, with an estimated 50 million tons. This new insulating ore would be eliminated from our mining future.

In the Sahwawe region there are unknown riches in tungsten, the war metal, and fast-machinery alloying metal. The Cooney families have 30 claims of rich ore in this region's very heart in addition to claims around the edge. One of their mining operations, which would have brought a sale of over \$1 million, has been canceled out by the Navy's threat.

Eagle-Picher Co. has 6 square miles of diatomaceous earth it had been working on for several years. It was included by the Navy in its plan, although its men claim to have worked over the entire region with trucks, jeeps, and helicopters. Nevada and Pershing County cannot afford to lose this industry. Navy has said it will release it, but the Bureau of Land Management has stopped all action. We have no assurance that it will be done. This mine would have 2,000 carloads of earth processed in a mill near Loveloek and would ship it for the filtering of antibiotics, beer, wine, sirups, sugar, and petroleum products.

Navy has leased 12 claims of mica (estimated) from Ira Stanley, a Loveloek miner, although 2 years of rental remain unpaid. This strategic mineral is lost to our mining industry.

The gold regions of Seven Troughs, Rosebud, Rabbit Hole, and the Trinity Range will be lost. They only await the revaluation of gold to become contributors to our creative wealth.

The effect on our livestock industry will be presented by Attorney Forrest Cooper. This is another of our basic industries, whose cattle are fed in Loveloek Valley during the winter, making use of our product—alfalfa hay.

The statement of a naval admiral to the effect that they would require 15 more properties in the rich Fallon Agricultural Valley, and additional land, such as Dixie Valley, in the Stillwater Range, indicates the danger of future expansion should the Navy increase its holdings in Nevada.

Dixie Valley is contiguous to Loveloek. It is in its trading area. It is in the southwest of Pershing County and northern part of Churchill County.

In this area are located the following:
One of the few nickel-cobalt areas in the United States. One of the largest potential copper areas left undeveloped in continental America. Large iron ore deposits that are now being mined and shipped to Detroit,

western points, and Japan. Large uranium deposits now under development.

ELIMINATION OF THE CATTLE INDUSTRY

Navy's plan to allow cattlemen to take their livestock into the grazing areas in the spring and take them off in the fall, ignores the facts of raising livestock on arid grazing lands.

Cattle and sheep must be constantly tended by cowboys. Daily or weekly attention is necessary to see that: (1) There is a water supply, (2) that feed does not give out through grazing or adverse weather, (3) that disease has not infected the herd, (4) to see that predators are not at work, (5) to guard against poaching or rustling.

On a few ranches in Pershing County, but on more in the adjoining Washoe County and Humboldt County areas that would be acquired under Navy's plans, the home ranches would be taken. The people would be evicted from their homes either through voluntary or forced sale. The raising of crops for winter feeding would stop. Ranching could not continue.

In the Navy's plan of acquisition, should grazing prove impossible and grazing rights be lost, there would be no way of repaying the livestockman for the loss of his grazing rights. Grazing is on the public domain, but a rancher must have rights on that domain to stay in business. So while no value would be placed on grazing rights, the grazing rights would be the most valuable asset of the rancher.

Roy G. Bankofier, leading rancher of Fernley stated before the Joint Legislative Committee on Livestock, Agriculture, and Mining, "The livestock industry and military cannot exist together. I have tried it."

DANGERS OF EXPANSION

Not only do present plans endanger the economy of Pershing County and adjoining regions, but the probability of expansion is as great or greater danger.

The office of Navy (understood over telephone from Senator MALONE's office on March 2, 1956) reported that it would have to look into the expansion possibilities of the Tonopah gunnery, turned loose by the Air Force on that date.

It must be concluded that if the speed of an airplane is doubled, it will take 4 times as much territory for its gunning. With the Navy having an unrelenting grip on northern Nevada, it is only logical to expect them to demand expansion there. The expansion would come east and west, since the policy is to avoid main railroads (Western Pacific and Southern Pacific). With great expenditures at Fallon completed, the argument for further expansion at the expense of basic industries would be inevitable.

IS NAVY OVERREACHING?

In asking for two separate gunnery areas—one north and one south of the Western Pacific tracks in northwestern Nevada—can it be that the Navy is asking for twice as much tow line as it really needs?

According to Capt. Harry Cook of the Navy, it can have five separate targets being towed around either of these areas at once with planes darting in from the outside to shoot.

It has been published that the plan is to have 1,000 sorties a day.

Targets would be towed at the rate of 180 miles per hour at the end of 2,000 foot cables, and would take long to get at gunnery height.

Incidentally, these sorties and towings would be made across the trans-continental airline between San Francisco and Salt Lake City, over United States Route 40, and over the Southern Pacific and Western Pacific main lines. No investigation of liabilities of these passages has been reported.

Lovelock is put within 5 miles of the gunnery and within 12 miles of the "towline." This is too near for safety. Assertions have been made that the line would be moved over, but there is no assurance that this will be done—just words.

THE TONOPAH GUNNERY

On Friday, March 2, 1956, the Air Force made available to the Navy the 1 million acres of the Tonopah bombing area.

This area has 6 airstrips on it.

The Tonopah base could be used for basing planes and tow targets that would take long to get at the proper gunnery height.

This would relieve the great congestion that is bound to arise if Navy's plans are carried out at Fallon.

Navy reports this would cost \$14 million more per year than flying over the northwestern Nevada territory. It would take 10 more minutes to make the distance.

There is no scientific information to combat any figures the Navy offers, thereby putting all considering their claims at a disadvantage.

But when one considers that Navy spent over \$200 million on 1 plane motor that failed, one wonders if there could be miscalculation here.

GUNNERY AT SEA

Consideration should be given to practice of gunning at sea.

The planes will fly off the flattops and fight off the flattops.

They will fly in or above the clouds, of which Navy complains.

Why is it necessary for planes to be thus used to fly off desert airfields in desert sunshine.

Navy says that 50 percent of the days are cloudy. They will also be cloudy during warfare.

What percent of the time are the flattops sending out their planes for gunnery. Surely not 50 percent of the time.

Is not practice at sea the real way of training naval airmen to fight at sea?

Should costs alone be considered?

Is the plan for a land-based vacation in Nevada?

The Navy's argument against gunnery at sea is not convincing.

CONCLUSION

We businessmen of Pershing County join with the 16 other groups listed on page 1, in asking that the Navy's application for money to take over private property interests in Pershing County, Washoe County and Humboldt County be denied.

It is our opinion that the future prosperity of our area is threatened and will be permanently set back by such acquisition. We have invested in the future of this area and there will be no remuneration for the losses we will suffer.

We see no way of stopping the Navy's expansion once they acquire the foothold they are seeking.

We believe they would utilize the Tonopah area just released by the Air Force and would thereby benefit that area, as it did in World War II. The vast expenditures on that base could partially be recovered.

We believe the Navy has not answered why it should not practice gunnery at sea.

As American citizens we ask that you withhold permission for the Navy to ruin our future.

Sincerely yours,

PERSHING COUNTY CHAMBER
OF COMMERCE,

By PAUL K. GARDNER, Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF PERSHING COUNTY

Whereas the United States Government by and through the Department of the Navy and the Bureau of Land Management has taken and is undertaking steps to appropriate large and vast areas within the county of Pershing,

State of Nevada, for the purpose of establishing an air to air gunnery range; and

Whereas numerous protests have been filed with the office of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, Reno, Nev., by owners of mining claims situate in said areas; and

Whereas each of said protestants has requested the Secretary of the Department of the Interior to hold a hearing concerning said appropriations and said withdrawals; and

Whereas in addition to the many valuable mines and mining claims situate in said areas, said areas comprise a large portion of the grazing lands available to the ranchers of Pershing County, for the purpose of grazing thereon their cattle, sheep and other livestock; and

Whereas the withdrawal of said areas would certainly work an extreme hardship upon said ranchers, by depriving them from the use of valuable range and rangelands, and would result in severe losses to them should they continue to graze their livestock in said areas; and

Whereas the county of Pershing has heretofore constructed and maintained roads and highways in said areas at considerable expense to said county; and

Whereas neither the Department of the Navy nor the Department of the Interior through its Bureau of Land Management have offered or proposed to compensate the said county of Pershing for the loss and deprivation of the use of the aforesaid roads and highways; and

Whereas the areas proposed to be withdrawn are in a close proximity to the city of Lovelock, to the towns of Oreana, Humboldt, Tungsten, and Mill City, all of which are situate in the county of Pershing, State of Nevada, and the undersigned board feels a marked concern for the safety of the people residing in said city and in said towns, and

Whereas the entire procedure of withdrawing and of proposing to withdraw said areas was certainly most ill-advised and has been undergone in a manner which was and remains clothed with a veil of secrecy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the undersigned board of county commissioners intends to, and hereby does protest most strenuously to the withdrawal or the proposed withdrawal of any and all areas situate in the county of Pershing by either the Department of the Navy or the Department of the Interior by and through its Bureau of Land Management for the Department of the Navy; be it further

Resolved, That the undersigned board of county commissioners intends to and hereby does demand that it be advised of any and all withdrawals or proposed withdrawals, so that at least the governing body and the officers thereof and those with whom is entrusted the welfare of the residents of the county of Pershing will know and be fully informed of the facts and circumstances surrounding such withdrawals; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent forthwith to the following named persons:

1. Commandant, 12th Naval District, San Francisco, Calif.

2. Mr. E. R. Greenslet, Director, Bureau of Land Management, Reno, Nev.

3. United States Senator "MOLLY" MALONE, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

4. United States Senator ALAN BIBLE, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

5. Congressman CLETON YOUNG, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Dated at Lovelock, Nev., this 16th day of August A. D. 1955.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF
PERSHING, STATE OF NEVADA,

By CECIL G. CAMPBELL,

Chairman.

Attest:

HENRY ANDERSON,
Clerk of the Board.

PERSHING COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
Lovelock, Nev., August 10, 1955.

HON. GEORGE MALONE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: On August 5, 1955, the Pershing County Farm Bureau met with the Pershing County commissioners regarding a protest on the proposed expansion by the Navy for the aerial gunnery range. The commissioners stated they had already protested and they suggested that all organizations and individuals write their Congressmen.

It is felt that this expansion would harm the livestock industry, the mining industry, and in general hurt the well-being of the county. The farm bureau feels that the lost revenue from the land would eventually mean higher taxes for the county. The range rights and management of this area in the public domain should at all times be protected and not be lost. We feel that every consideration should be given property owners in this area. Wildlife should be protected and not driven away from their natural habitat. Should there be outbreaks of weed infestation, insects, rodents, and predatory animals and livestock disease how would they be able to control them if this area was closed?

These are just a few points that have been brought out in regards to the expansion of the naval aerial gunnery range. We would appreciate your cooperation and help on this matter so important to Pershing County.

Very truly yours,

ERIC SEEBAS,
President, Pershing County Farm Bureau.

NEVADA FARM BUREAU,
Reno, Nev., February 16, 1956.

HON. GEORGE MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: After reviewing Senate bill 3183 we have found that a number of the provisions of the bill are in conflict with the policies developed by our membership.

Sections 101 and 102 providing for fixed 90 percent price supports have been universally opposed by our people, and section 105 re-establishing price supports on dairy products at 90 percent would be opposed by the majority of our membership.

The dual parity formula as set forth in 106 is in opposition to our thinking.

We would appreciate your favorable support in opposing these sections.

There are several other problems that have come to our attention during the past week, primarily, legislation concerning social security. Our delegates favor an optional inclusion under the Social Security Act and many of them have contacted us in regard to soliciting your support for this change if and when it comes upon the Senate floor.

Our State predator committee met in Reno a short time ago and after considerable discussion reached the conclusion that if our program were to be more effective and more satisfactory in the State that additional funds could be used to advantage in our State.

Of course the bombing range acquisition by the Navy has been definitely opposed by majority of the groups in our area. We feel that withdrawal of these lands would be a severe blow to the economy of our State.

Your support and help in opposing this withdrawal will certainly win favor with a great many of our people and will be greatly appreciated by us.

Thanking you for your cooperation in the past and with best regards.

Sincerely yours,

JOE WILLIAMS,
Executive Secretary.

RESOLUTION OF HUMBOLDT COUNTY FARM BUREAU

The Humboldt County Farm Bureau does hereby protest the proposed withdrawal of

approximately 2,026,880 acres of land in northern Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt Counties for use by the Navy as a bombing range and air-to-air gunnery range. The County of Humboldt is adversely affected by loss of industry, ranch, mining, and assessed value of property within Humboldt County.

The entire county farm bureau is of the opinion that such withdrawal will be extremely detrimental to Humboldt County, Nev., and it is the entire unanimity of opinion of all the people of the County of Humboldt to the same effect.

The Twelfth Naval District, the Bureau of Land Management, and the congressional delegation of the State of Nevada are here-with respectfully requested to prevent the withdrawal of land hereinabove described for said bombing range.

The secretary of the Humboldt County Farm Bureau is authorized and directed to forward a certified copy of this protest to the Commandant, 12th Naval District, E. R. Greenslet, Nevada Supervisor of Bureau of Land Management, HON. GEORGE W. MALONE, HON. ALAN BIBLE, and HON. CLIFTON YOUNG.

Passed and adopted this 3d day of September 1955.

TRACY BOGGIO,
Secretary.

I hereby certify the foregoing to be a true and correct copy.

GEO. S. HOSKINS.

PERSHING COUNTY
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Lovelock, Nev., May 13, 1955.
United States Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: At a special tourist meeting of our motel owners and others directly dependent upon the users of U. S. Route 40, concern was expressed over the plan to construct national highways across the country that would bypass most if not all Nevada towns.

The motel owner who brought this up was Cecil Gerst, operator of the Sage Motel. He said he had seen the plan and that it would be carried through in the next 10 years, if Federal Bureau of Roads people had their way.

It was brought out that a bureaucrat from that agency had refused to approve the route leading into Lovelock from the east saying it was not 200 feet wide and that the State of Nevada would have to pay for construction on it.

Such construction would ruin about 50 businesses in Lovelock. So you can see what danger there is to this community.

Our people would consider it a great favor as well as duty for you to oppose any such ruinous plans.

Thanks for your prompt attention to our various requests.

Cordially yours,

PAUL K. GARDNER,
Secretary.

HUMBOLDT COUNTY
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
Winnemucca, Nev., February 6, 1956.
HON. GEORGE MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONE: We have this date written to Congressman VINSON and Congressman SHEPPARD and Senator CHAVEZ and Senator STENNIS, requesting that they take no action on those items in the President's budget relative to condemnation or purchase of additional land in Humboldt County, Nev., for the Navy gunnery range until they have received recommendations from the Senate and House Interior Affairs Committee.

We are sure you are cognizant of the strong feeling in this county to this additional land grab by the Navy Department and the extreme hardship it would cause

to the tax structure of this county. We ask that you assist us in this matter and assure you that anything done on our behalf and on behalf of everyone in Humboldt County will be deeply appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
OF HUMBOLDT COUNTY, NEV.
FRANK SANDERS, Chairman.
CLETO BENGUA, Member.
GEORGE D. MELODY, Member.

RENO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Reno, Nev., August 12, 1955.
HON. GEORGE W. MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Whereas the United States Navy, for the benefit of the Naval Auxiliary Air Station, at Fallon, Nev., proposes to withdraw approximately 2 million additional acres of Federal and privately owned lands in Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt Counties, State of Nevada; and

Whereas the withdrawal of the above lands will seriously affect the economy of the State of Nevada and will be detrimental to the agricultural, grazing, and mining industries of the State of Nevada: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Reno Chamber of Commerce, Washoe County, Nev., urge the Honorable GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator for Nevada, to endeavor to delay said action until the real potential value of agricultural, grazing, and mining properties in the above area be determined and a public hearing be granted representatives of all of the said agricultural, grazing, mining, and recreational interests affected by the withdrawal of Federal and privately owned lands in Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt Counties, State of Nevada.

The above resolution was passed unanimously by the board of directors of the Reno Chamber of Commerce at a regular meeting held on Tuesday, August 9, 1955.

WILLIAM BRUSSARD,
Secretary-Manager.

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF MACHINISTS,
SPARKS LODGE No. 705,
Sparks, Nev., August 21, 1955.

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At a regular meeting of Local 705, I. A. of M., held August 10, 1955, I was instructed to write you regarding the withdrawal of land in Humboldt, Pershing, and Washoe Counties of Nevada to be used by the Navy as an aerial gunnery range.

A majority of our membership are sportsmen who do a good deal of hunting in this area and claim it to be one of the best areas in Nevada for hunting.

We hope that you will do all that is possible to retain this large acreage for the benefit of the miners, livestockmen, and sportsmen who have used it freely up to this time.

With the best personal regards, I remain,
Respectfully yours,

PHILIP S. DRURY,
Recording Secretary.

RENO, NEV., July 20, 1955.
Senator GEORGE MALONE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Suggest you investigate proposed land condemnation in Washoe and Pershing Counties of area approximately 100 by 50 miles for use as naval gunnery range, with thought in mind of destruction of deer, antelope, and upland game range and inaccessibility by Nevada sportsmen.

WASHOE ROD AND GUN
CLUB,
DUANE M. RAMSEY,
President.

Mr. JOHN SANFORD,
Reno, Nev.

DEAR JOHN: I am enclosing copies of the complete file on the withdrawal of the 2,026,800 acres Nevada territory in Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt Counties by the Navy for use as bombing range.

John, a prevention of the Navy withdrawal of this land will put an end to the Fallon Naval Air Station expansion. Governor Russell, and others, including the fish and game commission are opposing this land withdrawal. This matter is of such serious and extreme importance, that I believe the decision should rest with the State administration and the people of Nevada.

When the arguments have been weighed pro and con, and the decision has been made by the people of the State, I will go along with them and assist in any way that I can.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator.

AUGUST 5, 1955.

Mr. FRANK W. GROVES,

Director, State of Nevada Fish and Game Commission, Reno, Nev.

DEAR FRANK: Relative to the proposed withdrawal of 2,026,800 acres of Nevada territory in Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt Counties by the Navy for use as a bombing range, I am enclosing copies of the correspondence with Governor Russell and Mr. Callaghan, which are self-explanatory.

The situation is of such importance to the Lovelock and Fallon areas that I consider it best to put the cards on the table so that a decision for the best interest of the State of Nevada may be reached by the State administration and the people themselves. I will assist in any way possible in carrying out the program decided upon.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

GEORGE W. MALONE,
United States Senator.

RENO, NEV., July 26, 1955.

Senator GEORGE MALONE,

Washington, D. C.:

Nevada commission strongly opposes proposed Navy withdrawal consisting of 2,026,880 acres in northern Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt Counties. Majority of area consists of some of Nevada's best wildlife habitat for antelope, mule deer, sage hen, and chukars. Also some of Nevada's largest ranches and mining operations which, if eliminated, will adversely affect the economy of this part of Nevada. Commission respectfully urges that every effort be made to prevent said proposed withdrawal from being consummated.

FRANK W. GROVES,
Director.

SENATOR DECLARES OPPOSITION TO NAVY PLAN
IN OFFICIAL PRESS RELEASE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a release issued by my office dated March 2, 1956.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 2, 1956.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE today informed Department of Defense and Navy officials of his opposition to the proposed acquisition of 3 million acres in Washoe, Pershing, and Humboldt counties.

During a recent special trip to the State MALONE appeared before both Houses of the legislature to urge the formulation and expression of State policy in regards to Government land withdrawals.

"With the Government owning 87 percent of the land in Nevada," said MALONE, "a

realistic policy for the future is mandatory."

MALONE told his State Legislature that he was prepared to go either way on the issue but that he could not go both ways and stated, "Nevada must make up its mind whether or not it wants continued large withdrawals for military installations or development of its taxable property through its livestock, ranching, mining, and industries.

"Since this time the State of Nevada has expressed its policy through resolutions by both the State assembly and a special State senate committee, the latter by an overwhelming 8 to 1 vote.

"The decision, which has weighed in favor of Nevada's future growth in mining, ranching, and industry against immediate plans for increased military payrolls and other expenditures, has now been made and I will further this policy with every means at my disposal.

"However, these two important economic policies in the immediate case at hand, are not incompatible and I am working with Navy, Air, and Defense Departments to provide an equitable solution."

MALONE stated: "Governor Charles Russell has joined me in requesting the Air Corps, Navy, and the Army to coordinate their aerial training operations in the utilization of the areas already withdrawn for such operations.

"Particularly I have requested the coordinated Navy and Air Corps use of the huge Nellis-Tonopah bombing range, one of the largest and finest air facilities of this kind in the world.

"I have demanded reports on possible coordinated Navy and Air Corps utilization of this range, which is larger than most eastern States and am convinced that both branches can be adequately served from this area.

"Although joint Air and Navy reports indicate that in combined flight use, supporting Nellis Air Field would be saturated, I have pointed out this could readily be overcome by the reactivation of the huge Tonopah Airbase for Navy use, at the northwest end of that range which would be used for refueling and temporary personnel quartering. I have long urged the Defense Department to utilize this base to effect a maximum realization of the huge wartime expenditures to develop this field.

"I am happy to report that in working with the Department of Air in this matter, I have just been informed by General Twining that this Department would make available for Navy use at least 1 million acres in the northwest Nellis-Tonopah Range nearest the Tonopah and Fallon airfields."

MALONE followed this up with a meeting with Assistant Secretary of Navy, Raymond H. Fogler; his assistant, Thomas Callaghan; Adm. T. S. Comb, Deputy Chief, Naval Operations for Air; Capt. W. L. Davison, Aviation, Shore Establishment Branch; and Roger Fulling, Director of the Defense Department Office of Construction.

"I have been informed by this group," continued MALONE, "that the Navy will now study this area to determine if this area which has been made available will lend itself to the training programs planned for the Washoe, Humboldt, and Pershing County area.

"Since 1947 congressional policy has favored a coordination of service facilities and a future unification. The combined use of the Nellis-Tonopah Range will be a positive step in this direction and will evidence good faith on the part of the services involved.

"I will keep the people of the State of Nevada informed on this latest development and course of action."

JOHN TOM ROSS,
Executive Secretary to Senator
George W. Malone.

TAX VALUES GIVEN IN AREA NAVY SOUGHT FOR
GUNNERY RANGE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the present tax valuation by county in the proposed naval gunnery range.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESENT TAX VALUATION BY COUNTY IN
PROPOSED NAVAL GUNNERY RANGE

Washoe County: \$800,000 to \$10 million tax evaluation; \$40,000 (based on \$800,000) actual taxes annually.

Pershing County: \$360,000 tax evaluation; \$10,000 actual taxes annually.

Humboldt County: \$500,000 tax evaluation; \$12,200 actual taxes annually.

EIGHTIETH CONGRESS PASSED LAW TO UNIFY
ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, in 1947, which was my first year in the Senate, Congress passed Public Law 253 of the 80th Congress, which attempted to unify the armed services of the United States. We all know that for many years the armed services had grown like Topsy.

We had the First World War, which was my particular war so far as military service was concerned. Then we had World War II, during which I served as a special consultant to the Military Affairs Committee and to the Secretary of War on the subject of military establishments and on strategic and critical minerals and materials. Then we had the third world war, or the Korean police action, during which I served in the Senate.

I liked very little I saw done during those two wars, but that is another subject.

EACH SERVICE HAS SEPARATE AIR ARM

We did make an earnest attempt in 1947 to consolidate the armed services. They had worked at cross purposes, each one of them having its own various units within it. Each one, for example, had its own air unit. The Army had its own air unit and the Navy had its own air unit. Now I understand that there is an air unit in the Marine Corps. I am all for those services, but there are things that are just out of this world and that should not happen to any country.

NATIONAL SECURITY ACT OF 1947

World War II demonstrated with startling clarity that the demands of modern warfare called for a far tighter integration of all phases of national effort than was the case in World War I. In no field of our prodigious wartime endeavor had this need for unity of effort been more apparent than in the operations of the Armed Forces themselves. The solution to this very complex problem lay in a plan of voluntary coordination among the Army, Navy, and Air Force. In the face of such widely differing opinions, it is not strange that over 3 years elapsed before an acceptable solution was formulated, and the National Security Act of 1947 was enacted into law. This act was admittedly a compromise between the two extremes of opinion, but it was regarded at the time as the most suitable basis upon which to build for the future. The declaration of policy which appears in section 2 of that

act is so fundamental to the basic concept of the statute as to merit quoting it at this point. It reads:

In enacting this legislation, it is the intent of Congress to provide a comprehensive program for the future security of the United States; to provide for the establishment of integrated policies and procedures for the departments, agencies, and functions of the Government relating to the national security; to provide three military departments for the operation and administration of the Army, the Navy (including naval aviation and the United States Marine Corps), and the Air Force, with their assigned combat and service components; to provide for their authoritative coordination and unified direction under civilian control but not to merge them; to provide for the effective strategic direction of the Armed Forces and for their operation under unified control and for their integration into an efficient team of land, naval, and air forces.

An explanation of the National Security Act of 1947 is readily available to anyone who is interested. I merely wish to emphasize at this time that the emphasis was on unification and cooperation.

NEED ONE STRONG AIR CORPS, NOT FOUR

When I say this, Mr. President, it is with the most kindly approach to the 3 services, but they have 3 or 4 Air Corps in the Armed Services. We have to have air strength in order to hit fast, accurately, and hard enough to stop an enemy. But we do not need 4 Air Corps; we need 1 Air Corps.

I hope Congress will get around to this business before very long.

The reason I have brought it up today is that we were on the verge of having a complete naval air unit in Nevada. There is no doubt in the world that we needed it, if they are going to operate separately from the Air Corps.

AIR CORPS HOLDS VAST AREA

But the Air Corps already had an area 90 by 100 miles in extent, nearly 100 miles square. In Nevada we could put several States of the Union, and the only way they could be found would be if a prospector happened to run onto them some day. My State is 600 miles by 400 miles in extent. In my effort to coordinate the work, so far as my State is concerned, I do not intend to enter individually into any quarrel about who should do this or do that, but we have to have our feet on the ground, and I have introduced into the Record enough information for the Senate to understand that it is a serious matter in the public lands States.

AIR CORPS URGED TO SHARE HUGE AREA WITH NAVY

Therefore, I suggested to the Air Corps, knowing that they were not using all of its area, that it might set aside a million or more acres for the Navy, allowing the Navy to keep what they had in the Black Rock Desert and in the area north of Fallon and the smaller areas, and that the Air Corps and the Atomic Energy Commission keep what they had in the Tonopah bombing range.

The Atomic Energy Commission was utilizing its area, and the Air Corps was not. I am sure there is more land if the Navy has to have it.

SENATOR DISCUSSES PROBLEM WITH AIR CORPS AND NAVY OFFICERS

I invited Air Corps and Navy Department representatives to my office to talk the matter over.

When the representatives of the Air Corps and representatives of the Navy, all fine men and all for this country, left my office, they agreed to sit down and try to work out the problem. In doing that, they will be working together in the area, and it might be the start of their working together elsewhere in coordinating their bombing operations.

Mr. President, reactivation of the huge Tonopah Air Base for Navy use will certainly enlarge the use of that important field and will relieve the need for further withdrawal of valuable rangeland.

Mr. President, in connection with the ranges, the cattle and sheep ranges, in my State and the mining operations there, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the Record at this point excerpts from my report as State engineer, in June of 1932, as marked on pages 71 to 82.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE STATE RANGE COMMISSION

The proper control and utilization of the public lands within our State have been problems of major importance for at least 30 years, or since the number of livestock on the open range reached the point where all of the available feed thereon was completely utilized.

Public domain areas

	Forest reserves	Area	Unreserved public land	Unsurveyed
Arizona.....	11,466,626	72,838,400	16,911,367	7,846,000
California.....	19,026,819	99,808,850	20,209,421	5,749,634
Colorado.....	13,309,549	66,341,120	8,218,875	1,136,694
Idaho.....	19,300,773	53,346,560	10,734,420	1,882,805
Montana.....	16,170,658	93,296,640	6,900,144	78,320
Nevada.....	4,978,198	70,285,440	53,410,938	21,915,318
New Mexico.....	8,491,831	78,401,920	16,282,582	1,164,627
Oregon.....	13,297,838	61,188,450	13,227,141	92,411
Utah.....	7,475,782	52,597,760	25,147,867	11,955,734
Washington.....	9,598,372	42,775,040	951,903	14,202
Wyoming.....	8,460,755	62,460,160	17,035,537	617,501

The legislature created what is known as the State range commission in 1929 for the purpose of determining and reporting to the 1931 legislature the "principles, laws or policies that should apply to the grazing user of the natural range forage resources of the publicly owned lands within Nevada * * * that should prevail for the best public interest." The State engineer was made a member of that body by law. The report of this commission, dated March 4, 1931, to the legislature of the State of Nevada follows:

"The commission: Hon. F. B. Balzar, Governor, chairman; Hon. J. F. Shaughnessy, secretary; Hon. George W. Malone, State engineer, member.

"CONCLUSIONS

"1. That the highest development of the livestock industry of the State is dependent upon the proper use of the public lands for grazing purposes.

"2. That such proper use is only possible to the extent that a user or users can be assured of the benefits from his or their particular range.

"3. That the present economic setup, including existing equities and investments, must not be disturbed.

"4. That future prospecting and mining, and water development for irrigation purposes must not be disturbed.

"5. That any method of range unit control must provide like protection to all rightful users, regardless of the size of such units.

"6. That the taxable value of the outlying ranches used for livestock purposes is directly dependent upon the range units.

"7. That if protection is afforded such range units, agreements will be made, in the case of more than one user entitled to the same range, and that the result will be the building up of the range values in accordance with good practice.

"8. That if encroachments upon the legitimate user or users are prevented, then further improvements will be made upon the ranges, particularly the development of water for stock-watering purposes upon the winter ranges, where large investments for this purpose are necessary.

"9. That if a method can be found for the protection of range units by legislative action, allowing the economic trends of the industry to develop, it would be unsound to invite supervision of the ranges by either the Federal Government or State, necessitating large expenditures by these agencies and a corresponding tax upon the livestock industry.

"RECOMMENDATIONS

"That the present legislature should enact such legislation pointing to ultimate control of range units by the user or users of such range as can properly be enforced under the police powers of the State.

"It would then follow that if Congress acts favorably on the public domain committee report to the President in the matter of Federal recognition of the State's method of control of the range, the State legislature could then properly exercise such control, beyond the police powers of the State, to regulate the movement of livestock on the public domain.

"REPORT

"Report to the Legislature of the State of Nevada, March 4, 1931, pursuant to an act passed on March 26, 1929, creating the State range commission for the purpose of investigating range conditions. Section 2 of the act follows:

"Sec. 2. It shall be the duty of the commission to conduct a study and investigation to determine the principles, laws, or policies that should apply to the grazing use of the natural range forage resource of the publicly owned lands within Nevada; for the purpose of facilitating that relationship between that resource and the economic structure of Nevada, and particularly its proper contribution to the revenues thereof, that should prevail for the best public interest, as well as to make public from time to time its findings, and to foster and promote such steps as in its judgment are required for the best public interests in this connection."

"Organizations appearing before the commission during the hearings held include the following:

- "United States Forest Service.
- "Agricultural Extension Service.
- "Nevada Land and Livestock Association.
- "Mine Operators' Association of Nevada.
- "Bureau of Mines.
- "Bankers' Association of Nevada.
- "Nevada Taxpayers' Association.
- "Southern Pacific Co.
- "Western Pacific Railroad Co.
- "Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railway Co.
- "Chambers of commerce of various towns.
- "Other civic organizations.

"These organizations were practically unanimous in declaring that some form of range unit control is necessary, the Forest Service indicating that if turned over to them, they would immediately devise some method of allocating it to individuals.

"BASIS OF POLICY

"It is concluded, however, that any method adopted must provide a system or policy that will, over a period of years, develop along the following general lines:

"1. That the maximum taxable property and business revenues may be developed in the State through this natural resource, pending the time that the public lands may be taken up under the regular land or mining laws, with due regard to the expense and efficiency of such system.

"2. That due to the requirements of the industry upon these lands of little value, requiring as they do in most cases balanced winter, summer, spring, and fall ranges and ranch units, these economic units developed over a long period of years must not be upset, and that any method adopted must encourage development along the natural trends of the industry.

"3. That prospecting and mining for minerals, nonmetallic products, and other resources, or legitimate homesteading of lands where water may be developed, either surface or underground, for irrigation purposes must not be interfered with in any manner.

"4. That any method adopted must provide the same protection for all livestock units, regardless of the size of such units.

"There are approximately 55 million acres of unreserved, unappropriated public domain in Nevada, in addition to approximately 5 million acres within the forest reserve boundaries and of the unreserved area. Government reports show that an average of 40 acres for a sheep unit and 140 acres for a cow unit are required for grazing purposes. The low feed value of these areas creates a unique condition on the Nevada public domain that must be met.

"The maximum of taxable property and business revenues can only be developed through the natural conditions surrounding the industry. It has been demonstrated in this State that a livestock unit must consist of a balanced summer, winter, fall, and spring range. The winter range may consist all or in part of ranching property where sufficient feed can be raised to take care of the stock through the winter season. These ranches must be balanced against the range units.

"The value of the outlying ranches, where transportation conditions make it infeasible to raise agricultural products for the market, is dependent upon the range units. It is well known that the taxable value of the ranches is directly dependent upon the value of such range unit, and that when any of the range is lost, the carrying capacity of the unit is decreased without a decrease in the investment, the value of the whole unit thus being impaired.

"The present economic setup has been brought about through development over a long period of years, and the heavy general losses incident to any sudden change are to be avoided.

"The development of the industry for more than 50 years has followed natural economic trends and shaped itself to the natural conditions encountered, and this must be recognized in any system that may be adopted.

"The mining industry is very well satisfied with the present condition, and is one of the principal industries of the State, and any system adopted must not interfere in any manner with prospecting or mining development; or legitimate homesteading of such lands where either underground or surface water can be developed in sufficient quantities for irrigation purposes. Therefore, any system adopted along the lines of providing control of the use of such lands for grazing purposes should be such that it can be supplanted by more valuable uses, such as mining or irrigation.

"The livestock industry, following its natural economic trends, has developed various sized units, from a few head of stock up to several thousand sheep or cattle in one

unit, dependent upon the number of topographic and economic conditions. Any method adopted must take this situation into account.

"EVIDENCE CONSIDERED

"All of this evidence has been carefully considered, together with the experience of the various State departments having to do with range management, in order to arrive at a proper policy with reference to the use of the public lands of the State.

"RANGE POLICY

"The first use made of the public lands for the ranging of livestock was begun more than 60 years ago, and at that time no particular system of acquiring either the lands or the control of their use was available, and none was needed, since there was enough range for all purposes; but as time went on and greater numbers of livestock were brought into the country, it became increasingly evident that some control was necessary for the established user. This was attempted in various ways by the users of the range in accordance with existing laws, which were improved or added to from time to time, but in general hinged around two methods:

"1. Acquiring ownership of all of the available land or enough thereof to control strategic points, so that any other user, to make efficient use of the range, must become a trespasser, with the usual penalty.

"2. Owning or controlling the use of all of the available water for livestock purposes.

"Acquiring ownership of land did not prove successful for two reasons. In the first instance the land laws were not sufficiently broad to allow land to be acquired in all of the necessary points, and in the second place too large an investment was required. The feed value of the average public land was in no way commensurate with the cost of such land, and the taxes were too great to be supported by the livestock industry if all or any great amount of the land to be used for grazing purposes had to be owned.

"Controlling the use of all of the available water was not feasible for the reason that on the majority of the lands there was enough water to take care of considerably more livestock than the range could support, therefore rights could be acquired on the same watering hole or spring by different livestock organizations, and this could be continued even after there was no available range, and therefore led to overgrazing and range fights.

"THE STOCKWATERING ACT

"This condition caused the livestock industry to cast about for ways and means to better control range units, and in 1925 led to the enactment of what is known as the Nevada Stockwatering Act, which provides in general that the amount of feed available is the criterion for the granting of further stockwatering rights instead of the amount of water, and makes it mandatory for the State engineer to discontinue granting of further stockwatering rights when all of the available feed is being utilized from the subsisting rights, regardless of the amount of unappropriated water that might be available, and further provides a penalty for watering more than 50 head of livestock more than once a season at or within 3 miles of such subsisting right without the right so to do.

"ALL RANGE UTILIZED

"It is well known that all of the range has been utilized in Nevada for at least 25 years, and for that length of time any new stock that has been brought into the State have merely displaced, on an average, a like number that were already here and have not, therefore, increased the taxable wealth of the State. The Stockwatering Act, however, made it possible to prevent a continuation of this practice in the case of all ranges where grazing requires the use of watering places.

"PROTECTION POLICY AND RANGE MAPS

"Early in 1927 the State engineer's office announced a policy of protection for the user or users of any range to the extent that they would be notified directly when new applications were made for stockwatering rights within the limits of the range claimed by them, so that protests might be filed by them; and, also, that in the hearing of such protests the burden of proof was on the new applicant to show that there was range in that area not being utilized from subsisting rights. This policy is still in effect and, together with a system of range maps covering most of the State, has gone a long way toward stabilizing range values.

"RIGHT TO THE USE OF RANGE

"It is evident that where such large areas are required to support livestock units some method must be found that will eventually lead to a control of the range use in such manner that it is not necessary for the users to make large investments in lands of little value in order that the highest beneficial use of these values may be secured. This has led to a very careful investigation and study to determine whether or not it is possible to provide a system whereby control of the use of the range may be acquired in the same manner as the right to the use of water, retaining the control just so long as it is put to beneficial use, and could be lost by nonuse the same as the right to the use of water.

"CONTROL NECESSARY

"From the evidence gathered at the various hearings of the commission from widely varied interests, and from experience gained through long association with the industry, it is practically a unanimous conclusion that some form of control must be exercised and that range units must be controlled and their use limited to certain users so that there is no incentive to overgraze the lands, but that on the other hand the range values will be built up and developed in accordance with good range practice for the benefit of the industry, the State, and the Nation.

"METHODS OF CONTROL

"There are several methods by which such control can be obtained, which warrant consideration on their merits as to their efficiency and economy of operation in the management of these lands of little value, until such time as they may be taken up under the regular land or mining laws:

- "1. Private ownership.
- "2. Leasing system.
- "3. Federal supervision.

"4. Range unit control through State legislation along the lines of the Stockwatering Act to establish control over range units without supervision by any agency.

"Private ownership would be the ideal system if the lands had sufficient value and earning power to justify such ownership. In the first place, however, it appears that to bring about such ownership it would be necessary to reorganize the entire tax structure of the State so that lands could be assessed at a very low value, instead of a minimum of \$1.25 per acre as exists at this time, and also that it would be almost, if not entirely, impossible to set a price on such lands low enough that the livestock industry could stand the extra investment. Further, some of the public lands have very great mineral value, far in excess of their value for grazing purposes, and it seemed questionable whether large areas of such low grazing value should be allowed to pass into private ownership for that purpose alone, with the danger that prospecting for minerals might be retarded and, even when such minerals were found, the owners of the property might prevent development or make it so expensive that the incentive therefor would be impaired.

"The leasing system seemed to provide a logical method to determine who would be

entitled to the use of the grazing areas. However, that also seems to be inadvisable, since any leasing system must be predicated on the value of the lands for grazing purposes, and it would seem that on lands of so little value it might provide an extra load that might become very burdensome. Leasing would also require some kind of supervision, and it seems doubtful whether the earnings from such system would pay the supervision costs.

"Federal supervision along the lines the forest reserve now follows is a very efficient method. Some of the objectionable practices now followed could probably be ironed out and made entirely satisfactory, except that the fees charged must again be on a basis of what the feed is worth, and the grazing values are so small that it is difficult to fix a price low enough not to be burdensome. Further, such charges rarely cover the cost of supervision, so that the Government, then, is subjected to a continued expense beyond the return, and the stockmen are subjected to a continued charge which they are little able to bear at this time in addition to the necessary expenses already incident to their industry.

"It has never been the policy of the Government to charge for the grazing use of the unreserved public domain, even through the Middle West, but the practice has been to get it taken up for private use.

"PUBLIC DOMAIN POLICY

"The Government's policy for more than 100 years, relative to the public domain, has been to meet the situation with proper land and mining laws, so that patents may issue when the land is valuable enough for either agriculture or mining purposes to make it desirable, allowing the public use of such land and necessary regulation by the State until it has been taken up under the regular land or mining laws, or been reserved for some specific purpose.

"The policy of range unit control through State legislation along the lines of the Stock Watering Act to establish private control over range units, without supervision by any public agency or making necessary ownership of the land, seems to be the most feasible method, if it can be properly worked out so that the range users may have controlled use of the public lands for grazing purposes until such time as the land may be taken up for mining, homesteading, or other legitimate purposes. Under such a plan the users would only be putting out such expense as considered necessary by them, and providing ways and means of regulating the movement of livestock to make the most of the existing possibilities.

"STOCK WATER RIGHTS

"Control in the use of the range through stock water rights, as provided in the stock watering law, may now be held in either of two ways:

"1. Vested stock watering rights.

"2. Stock watering permits from the State.

"It is concluded by the commission that it would be unwise to initiate any legislation that would upset the established situation of range control as established in this connection, and which has received the approval of our State supreme court.

"SUPERVISION NOT NEEDED

"It is thought that it would not be necessary or advisable to project legislation beyond providing a method of establishing range control in the user or users of such range. This would protect such user or users from encroachment by others upon their range units without the need for supervision by any agency, and give them the opportunity to work out their own range problems in accordance with the most feasible method of range development possible in our circumstances.

"RANGE AGREEMENTS OR DISTRICTS

"It is not the fact that a range user must deal with other legitimate users of such range units or make arrangements to cooperate with such users that makes our range livestock industry uncertain—it is the fact that after adjustments have been settled, as between the rightful users, and agreements can be made or grazing districts formed between users to prevent overgrazing, an entirely new user may come in under certain conditions, upset the arrangement and cause improper use of such range, forcing the legitimate users to overgraze the range to gain any use for themselves. Range agreements between users are therefore rendered useless until some form of legislation can be had to prevent their subsequent upsetting.

"PROPERTY INVESTMENTS

"Property investments are the important thing in the State. Therefore, any legislation pointing toward range unit control by the users should take into account and encourage property investment.

"WATER DEVELOPMENT

"If control can be had over individual range units, it is believed that investments will be made on the range, especially in water development on the winter ranges, thereby causing a more efficient use of that area with a subsequent increase in the total range values of the State.

"The 1931 legislature, after considering the report of the Commission, passed what has since become known as the 1931 Range Act, which conforms to the recommendation of the Commission that: 'Legislation should be enacted pointing to ultimate control of range units by the user or users of such range as can properly be enforced under the police powers of the State.'

"Section 1 of the act provides:

"SECTION 1. It shall be unlawful to graze livestock on any part of the unreserved and unappropriated public lands of the United States in the State of Nevada, when such grazing will or does prevent, restrict or interfere with the customary use of such land for grazing livestock by any person who, by himself or his grantors or predecessors, shall have become established, either exclusively or in common with others, in the grazing use of such lands by operation of law or under and in accordance with the customs of the graziers of the region involved: *Provided*, That this act shall not prohibit the grazing on any part of such public lands of livestock owned, kept or used for work or milking purposes by any ranch owner or bona fide settler, for his domestic use, as distinguished from commercial use, nor prohibit the grazing of any livestock necessary for and used in connection with any mining or construction work or other lawful work of similar character. Customary or established use as graziers, otherwise than under the operation of law, as herein used, shall be deemed to include the continuous, open, notorious, peaceable and public use of such range seasonally for a period of 5 years or longer immediately prior to the approval of this act by the person or his grantors and/or predecessors in interest except in cases where initiated without protest or conflict to prior use or occupancy thereof. It is further provided that any change in such customary use so established shall not be made hereafter so as to prevent, restrict or interfere with the customary or established use of any other person or persons.'

"A penalty is provided for violation of this act.

"This act has since been held constitutional by the Fourth Judicial District Court in a well-written decision by Hon. L. O. Hawkins, in which he says in part:

"The legislature when enacting the 1931 grazing law no doubt had in mind the de-

visions of our Supreme Court upon the acts of 1919 (as well as the 1925 Stock Grazing law). And by the passage of such measure exercised its police powers to preserve the peace upon the public domain within its borders, hoping thereby to bring stability to a great industry of our people. Their efforts should not be set at naught, unless it clearly appears they exceeded their constitutional authority, or that the act is clearly in conflict with Federal laws upon the same matter.

"As hereinbefore stated, every legislative act is presumed to be constitutional and within legislative powers. That presumption should be allowed full weight in considering the constitutionality of the act now before court, for we all know and realize the magnitude of the evil sought to be created by the passage of that act. In addition to the hundreds of breaches of the peace committed because of controversies over range rights on the public domain, some of which have caused loss of human lives, and many prosperous ranch holdings have been rendered almost valueless by unrestricted grazing the nearby public domain; which deplorable state of affairs will continue if the act is held void, and most of which, if not all, will be avoided in the future by sustaining and enforcing the said law.

"There is no doubt that if the lands in question belong to the State the legislature could pass the Grazing Act of 1931, and although it is not the owner thereof, the people of this State, as well as those of our neighboring States, are entitled to protection in their use and enjoyment of the grasses growing upon those lands. The Federal Government has not yet seen fit to exercise any control over such lands, thereby assuring to said users peace and protection. Congress not having so acted, it seems to me not only the right but the duty of the States to regulate, and in proper cases prohibit, the use of such lands to the end they may be of the greatest benefit to the most people possible; ever having in mind the supreme duty of the State to preserve the peace within its borders.

"Believing the act constitutional, as being a reasonable exercise of the police powers of the State, that it creates no right in or grants no privilege to those individuals coming within the definition of 'established graziers,' that provision IV of the act grants unto plaintiff the right to injunctive relief, and that the complaint states facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against defendant, it is ordered that the demurrer of defendant be, and the same is, overruled.'

"The 1931 Range Act, in the opinion of livestock men familiar with its operation, dovetails with the 1925 Nevada Stock Water Act in that it provides for the control of the range by the customary users where ownership of the right to use the water for stock-watering purposes does not furnish such control. There is very little, if any, water available on the winter ranges. Snow is utilized as a substitute, and there is no provision for acquiring rights to its use.

"In 1925 the Nevada Stock Water Act was passed, and sections 2 and 3 of this act provide that:

"Sec. 2. Whenever one or more persons shall have a substitute right to water range livestock at a particular place, and in sufficient numbers to utilize substantially all that portion of the public range readily available to livestock watering at that place, no appropriation of water from either the same or a different source shall subsequently be made by another for the purpose of watering range livestock in such numbers, and in such proximity to the watering place first mentioned, as to enable the proposed appropriator to deprive the owner or owners of the existing water right of the grazing use of said portion of the public range, or to substantially interfere with or impair the value of such grazing use and of such water right.

"Sec. 3. Before approving any application for the right to use water for watering livestock, the State engineer shall determine, by examination on the ground or otherwise, that the right and use applied for will not contravene the policy of section 2 of this act. If he shall determine that the right applied for will contravene such policy, he must reject the application. If the water applied for shall be along the course of or in the immediate vicinity of an established or customary driving route for moving livestock from one range to another, the State engineer may reject the application even if no previous right shall exist for any portion of such water, if he shall determine that such water will best subserv the public interests by being reserved for the watering of livestock while so being driven along such customary driving route."

"A penalty is provided for violation of this act.

"The Supreme Court of Nevada has held this act constitutional.

"The Range Act, the Stock Water Act, and the work of this office, in connection with range control, are aimed at control of the range by the customary users without additional expense to the State, the Federal Governmental, or the users of such range.

"The Colorado law goes much further and provides for adjudication of the range, first as between sheep and cattle, and second in designating the number of either kind of livestock that any one user may have on any range used in common. Legislation of this character may very well form another step in our progress in range control when our legislature may judge that we ready for it. This may be done in the same manner as our water adjudications are now handled, through the State engineer's office, at a minimum of expense, and the decisions made subject to appeal to the district court for review, as in the case of applications for permit to appropriate water.

"The State engineer, acting also as a member of the State range commission, has assisted in organizing several range districts, as suggested in the report of the range commission to the 1931 legislature, which are located for the most part in the winter range in the southeastern part of the State, where water does not control the range and where they must rely in a large measure on the 1931 act.

"H. R. 11816, known as the Colton bill, provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall take over at his discretion any or all of the unreserved and unappropriated lands, provide for their supervision, and charge what he considers the feed is worth for range purposes under leases. This bill was introduced by Hon. Don Colton, Congressman from Utah.

"The State engineer appeared before the Public Lands Committee in Washington, D. C., May 17, 1932, and testified in regard to Nevada's position on any national legislation relative to control of the public domain, and later submitted a brief which is included in the published hearings (on p. 32) on H. R. 11816, May 3 to June 2, 1932.

"The conclusions and recommendations made to the Committee on Public Lands at that time follow:

"CONCLUSIONS

"1. That of the 180 million acres of unappropriated unreserved public domain in the 11 Western States, 55 million acres, or 30 percent, are included in Nevada; and that of the 52 million acres of the remaining un-surveyed territory in this area, 22 million acres, or 42 percent, are located within Nevada; and that 90 percent of the area of the State is drained into lakes and "sinks" located entirely within the State.

"2. That Nevada being the sixth largest State in the Union (70 million acres), has less

population (91,000) and the least taxable property (\$208 million) of any State.

"3. That due to such widely varied conditions, from absolutely barren areas in the Great American Desert through Nevada to the short-grass country in States of greater rainfall, with elevations ranging from below sea level to more than 10,000 feet above, with climate ranging from 50° below zero in winter to 130° above in summer in different areas, that no one method of range control will fit all conditions, making it absolutely essential to follow long adopted policies in local areas.

"4. That some regulation is both necessary and desirable.

"5. That such regulation can be brought about by "operation of law" protecting the "customary user," through the policy adopted by the Nevada statutes, without additional expense to the Government, and very little to the range user, and that any system adopted must recognize agreements made in associations or districts composed of actual users of such rangelands.

"6. That the long-established policy of the Government in relation to the public lands should be continued, passing the lands into the hands of the legitimate users of such lands, on the payment of nominal filing fees.

"7. That on lands such as those included in the Nevada area, where Government records show that it requires 140 acres to support a "cow unit" 1 year, and 40 acres for a "sheep unit," any charge made comparable with the value of the feed upon such lands would not pay for its supervision.

"8. That adequate watershed protection will be had when the "customary user" of the range is allowed to protect such range by "operation of law," and can build up and protect his range in accordance with good practice. Where the range is protected the watershed protection is automatically taken care of.

"9. That the Stock Grazing Act, allowing the location of 640 acres where no water is found, should be repealed, since that amount of acreage is of no practical value, and only allows unscrupulous individuals to locate such homesteads inside of range units already established and built up, thereby forcing the "customary user" to buy the homesteads.

"10. That principles and policies of "range control" adopted by law, by any State, regulating the movement of livestock upon the public lands for the protection by law of the users of such lands must be recognized, then such laws are not discriminatory between the States, thereby recognizing associations or districts made up of owners of established "units," operating at no expense to the Government and very little to themselves. It is concluded that any method setting up a new system of charges in this connection at this time would be unwise.

"RECOMMENDATIONS

"1. That any public-land legislation passed by the Congress of the United States should recognize policies and methods adopted by State law regulating the movement of livestock on the public domain that are not discriminatory between the States.

"2. That the operation of any method inaugurated by the Congress, providing for supervision of such public lands, should be made optional with the State involved or with associations or districts made up of the "established users" of such rangelands."

ISSUE OF WITHDRAWING PUBLIC LANDS COULD REACH WIDE SCOPE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I wanted to put this matter before the Senate because it may be that the withdrawal of large areas from public-lands States on the theory that most of the areas were not heretofore utilized, could develop into more than a local situation.

That is the reason why I emphasize that the people of Nevada for approximately a century have utilized every acre of public lands, and if there were any way in the world to obtain a patent to those lands, they would have done so.

Mr. President, on my recent return to Nevada, I rode for a week with cattlemen in southeastern Nevada. Every once in a while I get away from Washington. I have a little quarter horse, and I ride with a man who runs 700 or 800 head of cattle. A cow unit requires 140 acres. A person can ride 30 miles and if he finds 20 head of cattle he is doing pretty well. That is the way feed is utilized in the public lands of the 11 Western States. There is no other way of harvesting feed. Therefore, Mr. President, I thought the question was serious enough to take it to the Senate to explain it.

NAACP AND LUCY CASE

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the New Orleans Item of March 4, 1936, entitled "NAACP and Lucy Case."

The New Orleans Item is one of the most liberal newspapers in the South.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TACTICS ROUSE RESENTMENT—NAACP AND LUCY CASE

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has proved a poor stage manager in the Autherine Lucy case.

What sympathy Autherine Lucy might have had as an individual seeking better educational opportunities has been largely lost for Autherine Lucy, the NAACP's pawn in its Alabama court campaign.

From the moment this 26-year-old Birmingham woman was escorted by NAACP officials to register at Alabama University, her every act has seemed plainly contrived to fit this organization's tactics.

And the NAACP's tactics have been arrogant enough to anger even those Southerners like William Faulkner, Mississippi's Nobel prize-winning author, who has long pleaded the Negro's case against discrimination.

"I was against compulsory segregation. I am just as strongly against compulsory integration," Faulkner said Thursday. "Firstly, of course, from principle. Secondly, because I don't believe compulsion will work."

The NAACP gave the university trustees ground for expelling Miss Lucy when it filed in her name a suit containing the ridiculous charge that the university officials had conspired against her.

Though evidently they realized their error and withdrew the accusation that President Carmichael and the university administration "intentionally permitted persons to mill about on the campus" to simulate "an air of riot, disorder and rebellion" as an excuse for refusing to allow her to attend classes, the damage was done.

The charge was simply absurd in the light of Dr. Carmichael's statements and actions throughout the whole affair, and its insincerity showed too plainly.

The NAACP's next action—whisking their controversial student away to New York by the next plane—was another affront to Southerners who bitterly resent Northern masterminding.

Not only has the NAACP outsmarted itself in this case, by its own intolerance and unreasonableness it has endangered the very cause of tolerance it professes to serve.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I think there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time. Therefore I move, Mr. President, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 6, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 5 (legislative day of March 2), 1956:

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Stanley N. Barnes, of California, to be United States circuit judge, ninth circuit, vice William E. Orr, retired.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Leonard Andrew Scheele, of Michigan, to be Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service for a term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 5, 1956

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. R. Paul Caudil, First Baptist Church, Memphis, Tenn., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, we thank Thee for our Nation, and for those used of Thee to make our land a goodly heritage. Bless, we pray Thee, the people of these United States, and those who represent us in Congress and in other places of public trust.

Help us to distinguish between the things that differ, and to know that the perils that confront the world are the result of the scourge of materialism that has invaded every realm of our existence.

Forgive us of our failure to live in accord with the teachings of Thy word, and so transform our lives, we beseech Thee, in all their ways, that we may become effective instruments of freedom and peace for all mankind. Through Jesus Christ our Lord we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 2, 1956, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 500) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. WATKINS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

UPPER COLORADO RIVER PROJECT

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado.

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to formally thank each Member of this honorable body who last Thursday supported by his vote the legislation authorizing the upper Colorado River project. I am sure that while expressing my personal appreciation I also express the thanks of the other Members of the House who represent the States of the upper Colorado River Basin, several of whom sponsored similar bills. Also, I am happy to convey the gratitude of the people of this area, many of whom have sent messages of appreciation to me since the House passage of this bill.

In particular I desire to express to the leadership on both sides of the aisle the gratitude of those of us representing the upper Colorado River Basin States. We understand fully that it was their support and cooperative helpfulness that meant so much in the successful outcome of this struggle.

It is my understanding that H. R. 3383, the upper Colorado River project bill, received the strongest bipartisan support ever given to so large a reclamation project—this particular project, according to my information, being one of the largest if not the largest single reclamation authorizing bill to ever come before this body.

The vote on the legislation is indicative of this bipartisan support, as well as the universality of the nationwide approval of this program. On the Democratic side of the aisle, 136 voted for passage, 11 paired for passage, 63 voted against passage, 9 paired against passage, and 12 were absent and not recorded. Thus, 67 percent of the Democrats voted or paired in support of the measure and 33 percent were opposed. If consideration is given to total House membership, then 64 percent of the Democrats were shown to be favorable.

On the Republican side of the aisle 120 Republicans voted for passage, 1 paired for passage, 73 voted against passage, 3 paired against passage, and 5 were absent and not recorded. Thus, 61 percent of the Republicans voted or paired in support of the measure and 39 percent were opposed. If consideration is given to total House membership, then 60 percent of the Republicans were shown to be favorable.

As stated in the beginning, this is an outstanding example of a successful bipartisan approach to one of our most important domestic problems—reclamation and water-resource development.

Again, my sincere personal thanks to those who were able to support the bill.

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today marks the first day of the 32d year in the Congress for our distinguished minority leader. I know not only Republicans but Members on both sides of the aisle will heartily endorse what our President has written to our dear friend, JOE MARTIN, when he said:

You have come to represent the truly American character of the two-party system—party integrity, responsibility and loyalty, on the one hand; on the other, an earnest recognition that in all matters concerning the security of the Republic and of all Americans, there must be a bipartisan unity which in its spirit and expression overrides all party differences.

We all salute our dear friend, the minority leader on this happy occasion and wish him many, many years of health, happiness and continued useful service to his beloved country.

The complete text of President Eisenhower's letter follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 3, 1956.

The Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.,
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOE: Tomorrow you celebrate your 31st anniversary as a Member of Congress. With all your friends and associates, with all who know you as citizen and legislator, I join in warm congratulations.

Through your years of national service, you have come to represent the truly American character of the two-party system—party integrity, responsibility, and loyalty, on the one hand; on the other, an earnest recognition that in all matters concerning the security of the Republic and of all Americans, there must be a bipartisan unity which in its spirit and expression overrides all party differences.

On this occasion I should like to add a deeply personal wish which, I am sure, is shared by millions—that for many years to come you will continue greatly to serve your district, your party, and all America.

As ever,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, the reelection of a Member of Congress again and again is a great tribute, the significance of which he rarely understands but one which is fully understood by the electorate. The people whom JOE MARTIN represents appreciate his honesty, his character, his Americanism, and his faithfulness to duty, and it is natural that they demand his continued service in their interest. That is why our beloved colleague has served so many years with little likelihood that he will cease to be reelected for years to come.

We in the House of Representatives who know him love him and are proud to